

December 1, 1971

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 19995

technological change or the relocation of industries.

(c) (1) It shall be the duty and function of the Commission, in order to achieve the objectives set forth in subsection (b) of this section, to encourage and assist in the organization and the work of labor-management-public committees and similar groups on a plant, community, regional, and industry basis. Such assistance shall include aid—

(A) in the development of apprenticeship, training, retraining, and other programs for employee and management education for development of greater upgraded and more diversified skills;

(B) in the formulation of programs designed to reduce waste and absenteeism and to improve employee safety and health;

(C) in the revision of building codes and laws, in order to keep them continuously responsive to current economic conditions;

(D) in planning for provision of adequate transportation for employees;

(E) in the exploration of means to expand exports of the products of United States industry;

(F) in the development, initiation, and expansion of employee incentive compensation, profit-sharing and stockownership systems and other production incentive programs;

(G) in the dissemination of technical information and other material to publicize its work and objectives;

(H) to encourage studies of techniques and programs similar to those in paragraphs (A) to (H) of this subsection, as they are applied in foreign countries; and

(I) in the dissemination of information and analyses concerning the economic opportunities and outlook in various regions and communities, and if information on industrial techniques designed for the increase of productivity.

(2) The Commission shall transmit to the President and to the Congress not later than March 1 of each year an annual report of its previous year's activities under this Act.

(3) The Commission shall perform such other functions, consistent with the foregoing, as it determines to be appropriate and necessary to achieve the objectives set forth in subsection (b) of this section.

(d) (1) In exercising its duties and functions under this Act—

(A) the Commission may consult with such representatives of industry, labor, agriculture, consumers, State and local governments, and other groups, organizations, and individuals as it deems advisable to insure the participation of such interested parties;

(B) the Commission shall, to the extent possible, use the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of other Government agencies as the President may direct as well as of private agencies and professional experts in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided;

(C) the Commission shall coordinate such services and facilities referred to in subsection (B) above in order to supply technical and administrative assistance to labor-management-public committees and similar groups referred to in subsection (c) (1);

(D) the Commission shall establish the regional offices and such local offices as it deems necessary;

(E) the Commission shall hold regional and industrywide conferences to formulate ideas and programs for the fulfillment of the objectives set forth in subsection (C);

(F) the Commission may formulate model programs to ameliorate the effects of unemployment caused by technological progress;

(G) the Commission may furnish assistance to parties in collective bargaining entering into collective bargaining agreements; and

(H) the Commission may review collective bargaining agreements already in effect or those being negotiated to ascertain their effects on production.

the power to make recommendations with respect to the agreements made or about to be made in specific industries.

(2) The Commission may accept gifts or bequests, either for carrying out specific programs which it deems desirable or for its general activities.

(e) (1) The Executive Director of the Commission shall be the principal executive officer of the Commission in carrying out the objectives, functions, duties and powers of the Commission described in subsections (b) through (a) of this section.

(2) The Executive Director of the Commission, with the approval of the Chairman of the Commission, is authorized to employ, and fix the compensation of, such specialists and other experts as may be necessary for carrying out its functions under this Act, with regard to the provision of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and with regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, and is authorized, subject to such provision, to employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out its functions under this Act and fix their compensation in accordance with the provisions of such chapter 51 and subchapter II of chapter 53.

(f) The authority for funding referred to in title II of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (Public Law 91-379) shall apply to this section.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate may be authorized and directed to make any necessary clerical and technical changes in the engrossment of the bill (S. 2891).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ASSISTANCE TO RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 18) to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty which was to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That there is established a commission to be known as the Commission on International Radio Broadcasting (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") composed of nine members as follows:

(1) Two Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(2) Two Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate.

(3) Two members appointed by the President from among officers and employees of the executive branch of the Government.

(4) Three members appointed by the President from private life, including experts in mass communication in the broadcasting

(5) The President shall designate one of the members appointed from private life to serve as Chairman of the Commission. Any vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

Sec. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to review and evaluate international radio broadcasting and related activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

(b) The Commission shall submit its report to the President for transmission to the Congress not later than November 30, 1972, setting forth the results of its findings and conclusions, together with such recommendations as it may deem appropriate, including, but not limited to, recommendations with respect to future management, operations, and support of such activities; establishment of a corporate or other entity to administer support for, or to conduct, such activities; and protection of the right and equities of past and present employees of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

(c) The Commission shall cease to exist on July 1, 1973.

Sec. 3. (a) In addition to his function as head of the Commission, the Chairman of the Commission shall provide grants to support the broadcasting activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and submit to the President for transmission to the Congress not later than November 30, 1972, and July 1, 1973, reports, with financial appendices as appropriate, of each grant made and a statement describing the utilization of each such grant.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Chairman for carrying out the purposes of this section, \$36,000,000 for the fiscal year 1972 and \$38,520,000 for the fiscal year 1973. Except for funds appropriated pursuant to this section, no funds appropriated after the date of the first appropriation pursuant to this Act may be made available to or for the use of Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty.

Sec. 4. (a) Members of the Commission who are Members of Congress or officers or employees of the executive branch shall serve without compensation for their services as members of the Commission. Members of the Commission who are not Members of Congress or officers or employees of the executive branch shall receive per diem at the daily rate prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule by section 5316 of title 5 of the United States Code when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission. All members of the Commission, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703(b) of title 5 of the United States Code.

(b) The Chairman of the Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary. Such personnel may be appointed without regard to provisions of title 5, United States Code, covering appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. Any Federal employee subject to civil service laws and regulations who may be appointed by the Chairman shall retain civil service status without interruption or loss of status or privilege. In no event shall any individual appointed under this subsection receive as compensation an amount in excess of the maximum rate for GS-18 on the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) In addition, the Chairman of the Commission is authorized to obtain the services

S 19996

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

December 1, 1971

of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the maximum rates for GS-18 on the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist it in carrying out its duties under this section.

(e) The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

Sec. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as may be necessary for its administrative expenses.

And amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize the creation of a commission to evaluate international radio broadcasting and related activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, to authorize appropriations to the Chairman of the Commission, and for other purposes."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House and agree to the request for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. CRANSTON) appointed Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. CASE conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nomination of Earl Lauer Butz, of Indiana, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). The nomination on the Executive Calendar, as requested by the Senator from Montana, will be stated.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Earl Lauer Butz, of Indiana, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, there will be no more votes tonight. An agreement has been reached that the vote on the nomination of Mr. Butz will occur at the hour of 1 p.m. tomorrow, there will be plenty of time for discussion.

I anticipate that there will be a certain amount of discussion tonight and the rest tomorrow.

Following disposal of this nomination, the so-called drug control bill will be brought up. There is a time limitation on that also and, undoubtedly, there will be rollcall votes on that, as well as on the nomination of Mr. Butz.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield, there is one addition beyond that, the agreement concerning the conference report on the OEO, is that not correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, that is correct. It has been consummated and there will be votes on that, too, I am sure. We hope also to get the other pieces of legislation as they become available.

My understanding is that the House tomorrow will take up the District of Columbia appropriation bill and the supplemental appropriation bill. We would hope to get started on those Friday morning and then, shortly thereafter, we will be on the Supreme Court nominations.

Mr. GRIFFIN. By "shortly thereafter" does the Senator mean on Friday that we will be taking up the Supreme Court nominations?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the present intention, if the Senator will allow me a little leeway. But, just as soon as possible. If we clear the decks we, will get to the Supreme Court nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNEY). Time is now under control.

Who yields time?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 minutes, and then I want to yield to the Senator from New York some time and that, so far as I know, would be all the speaking that will be done on this side tonight.

Mr. President, I do not expect to say much about Earl Butz today except to point out as stated in the report which is now on the Senators' desks that "it was clear and was so indicated a number of times that the character, integrity, and ability of Dr. Butz was not in question."

The testimony against him was based largely upon what Earl Butz must have been thinking 20 years ago and what he might be thinking after becoming Secretary of Agriculture.

His critics seem to have a much higher degree of mental telepathy than I have, since I do not know what he thinks from day to day and year to year.

In fact, it would be much easier for me to read what is in the minds of those who so ardently oppose him.

What I would like to discuss briefly is the agriculture of the United States and more specifically the Department of Agriculture and its prospects for the future.

And the question which keeps recurring in my mind is this: Does the Department of Agriculture have a future or will it be broken up, with the pieces being discarded or assigned to other agencies?

The Secretary of Agriculture has been the target for people with varying motives for the last 35 years and with the single exception of 2 years when our colleague, the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. CLINTON ANDERSON) held that position, every Secretary has been a target for abuse and harassment.

During the time when Senator ANDERSON was Secretary of Agriculture, the grain reserves of this country were so low that the principal protests came from those who felt that our food supply might be in jeopardy if we did not curtail our postwar exports to other countries.

I earnestly hope that St. Peter has one of his choicest spots reserved for departed U.S. Secretaries of Agriculture.

They deserve it.

Going back to the beginning of our national existence, we find that over 80 percent of our population was then engaged in agriculture and made their living from the land.

Today we find not over 10 percent of our population actually engaged in producing food and fiber crops, but twice that number find gainful employment in making farm supplies and equipment, transporting farm commodities, and handling and processing the products of the American farmer.

Agriculture still furnishes more gainful employment than any other industry.

The land itself has not changed but the use of it has changed tremendously.

Much of it, particularly east of the Mississippi, has reverted to woodland, while nearly all that is now cultivated is producing far more per acre than our ancestors ever dreamed would be possible.

Except for certain specialized crops, a small farm which we used to call the family farm cannot today produce enough to support a family decently.

We no longer have the five- to ten-cow dairy or the one- or two-mule cotton farm, at least not in any great numbers.

As in other walks of life, farm mergers have become the order of the day and are also necessary if one is to take advantage of modern methods and modern equipment with which to produce efficiently and profitably.

Further than this, thousands of farmers, large and small, have incorporated their holdings for the protection of their families and to qualify for social security benefits later in life.

This accounts for much of the increase in the number of corporation farms. Many farms wholly owned by families today run into the thousands of acres and millions of dollars of production.

In my own State of Vermont, we have only one-third as many dairymen as we had a few years ago, but we are producing more milk than ever on fewer acres, with herds running into the hundreds and thousands, but they are still family owned and operated.

This means that as mergers have taken place and small farms are abandoned, the so-called farm population has been decreasing for well over 20 years, though at a slowly declining rate.

However, it is obvious that the end is not yet.

Neither Secretaries Anderson, Brannan, Benson, Freeman, nor Hardin could have stopped this decline even if it had been advisable.

And I expect it will continue as economic pressures and other inducements increase their influence.

No Secretary of Agriculture can prevent this evolutionary change.

However, as "farm population" has decreased, "rural population" has actually increased in Vermont and in many other States.

A small farm which two decades ago produced a meager living for one family may now be occupied by two or three or

December 1, 1971

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 19997

more families due to the rapid increase in residential and recreational development.

Improved highways and other facilities formerly available only to urban dwellers have made this possible.

In some other areas, particularly the northern plain States, the merging of farms has indeed created a genuine problem resulting in a decrease in population, since the alternatives which exist in the East are not generally available to those areas.

This is one problem—but not the only one—which has given Presidents, Secretaries of Agriculture, and the Congress much concern.

Farmers, on the whole, however, are living infinitely better than they did a generation or even 10 years ago and are more able to afford better living standards.

We cannot pick them out in the audience anymore—and more of their children get higher education.

This progress, however, has come about the hard way and in the historic recessions which have afflicted us from time to time, the farmer has usually been the major victim.

And after each recession the people on the land have emerged fewer in numbers but somewhat higher on the scale of living.

The depression of the thirties is still keenly remembered by many Members of this Senate today.

During that period, hogs sold as low as \$3 a hundred, wheat for 50 cents a bushel, milk for \$1 a hundred, and potatoes 10 cents a bushel when any market could be found at all.

I know whereof I speak, because I was one of the lucky ones who got \$5 a hundred for hogs, although I did have to give away my potatoes for livestock feed.

But during this period, Government came into the picture in a big way and Government has remained the star actor in this drama of rural life ever since.

Until the 1930's, processors and dealers almost always set the prices which farmers received for their products.

And, believe me, those prices were never very munificent.

With the competitive processing and marketing practices of those days they could not be.

One took what he was offered or else.

But in the 1930's when times got really hard and the depression afflicted other business and professional people as well, things began to happen.

Of course, Government had to save the banks first, but farmers and consumers received attention to a degree which had never been their lot before.

During the 1930's, marketing orders came into general use—first for milk and then expanded to cover other commodities.

At this point, I might mention that while Earl Butz was Assistant Secretary of Agriculture during a short time in the fifties, the number of milk marketing orders are as increased from 48 to 74, the sharpest increase in history.

But in the thirties, the REA was established and the private utility companies

did not have the foresight to take it over when they could have, so REA co-ops spread across the land carrying light and power to farms which might otherwise have been given up.

Support prices, farm loans, and guarantees helped put prices upward somewhat.

In 1935, the social security system was set up, and Vermont was the first State to cooperate with all phases of this new program.

And along about 1939 or 1940 the food stamp program got its first tryout.

But farm prices increased slowly until World War II brought them to a level which for a time made most phases of agriculture profitable.

That was the last war which, temporarily, improved agricultural income.

The Korean war had an adverse effect and the 10-year war in Southeastern Asia from 1961-71 has been costly to agriculture as well as to our political and economic policies.

While in 1970 farmers were taking in \$10.9 billion more than they were in 1965, costs of production went up \$10 billion during that time, leaving only \$900 million as the net increase over the last 3 or 4 years. However, there are fewer farmers to divide that up. So it is not quite as bad as one might think.

Compared to the increase in family living costs—this \$900 million which was gained from 1965 to 1970—was inadequate, although increased Federal amounts for education and other purposes have helped out materially.

As I stated in the beginning of this talk, I have made little reference to Earl Butz, although I support him fully and feel that as an administrator he will compare very favorably with any other Secretary of Agriculture I have known.

However, Earl Butz is not the issue in this controversy.

He is the symbol—a political symbol—as many believe.

Congress writes the laws relating to agriculture and international trade and laws relating to welfare and crime and a lot of other things.

Congress does not administer these laws and Congress does not administer farm programs.

The administration of the law is vested in the executive branch of Government of which the President is the head.

He appoints administrators for the various departments and agencies of Government.

The duty of these administrators including the Secretary of Agriculture is to administer the programs which the Congress has established.

But like the heads of other agencies, they work under the direction of the President and it is the President upon whom the responsibility for proper administration of these programs rests.

The Secretary of Agriculture cannot and should not be expected to administer the programs for agriculture in a manner not approved by the President.

And, therefore, if there is dissatisfaction with the handling of the farm programs, it is the President and not the Secretary of Agriculture who should be held responsible.

And if Congress hamstring him in making his principal appointments, even the President cannot be held responsible for results which affect the country adversely.

Indeed, if we analyze even superficially the condemnation of Earl Butz, it is evident that the attacks on him are aimed directly at the President partly in an effort to make his administration unpopular.

Earl Butz was indeed an official of the Department of Agriculture during most of the administration of the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

So far as I know, he was an orthodox Assistant to the Secretary, with his most important contribution to American agriculture being the development, the enactment, and the putting into operation of Public Law 480 which some now prefer to call the Food-for-Peace Act.

This has developed into one of the most important programs affecting American agriculture during the last generation.

It has resulted in the expansion of American exports abroad.

In fact, we are told that this program has been so successful that the production of one out of every 4 acres is now exported to other countries.

Our export of farm commodities will probably reach a total of about \$8 billion this year, most of which will represent commercial sales.

Without the cooperation of the so-called agribusinesses these so-called exports would have been impossible.

At this point let me say that the biggest agribusinesses in this country with which Earl Butz has been concerned are the farm cooperatives. Over 70 percent of all dairy products of this country are handled and processed through farm cooperatives. This is agribusiness in itself, and in a lesser amount other commodities, such as citrus fruits, a large percentage of which are handled and processed by cooperatives. The small family farmer certainly could not exist and make his farm pay if he had not had the cooperative agribusiness to handle his products for him.

The cost of Public Law 480 has dropped from about \$2 billion a year to half that amount while exports of farm crops for dollars have increased 300 percent.

Public Law 480 has also undoubtedly kept some countries in the world from abandoning democracy and going over the hill into the other camp.

If he has done nothing else but aid in the preparation, enactment and development of our agricultural export program, including Public Law 480, Earl Butz has earned a well-deserved place in our agricultural history.

It may be said that Earl Butz is too old-fashioned—a relic of the past—and not mod.

He still believes in the agricultural college—the experiment station—the extension service and nonsensical ideas, according to some people, like 4-H clubs and future farmers—things to which he has up to now given his whole life.

It so happens that one of the most distinguished Members of this body Senator

S 19998

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

December 1, 1971

BIRCH BAYH the junior Senator from Indiana, is a product of these courses, which he pursued at Purdue University under Earl Butz. But Earl Butz still believes in these things, and, up to now, he has given them his whole life.

And, to the chagrin of his critics, he will continue to support these institutions as Secretary of Agriculture, and I think that should be indicated for the RECORD.

As I said in the beginning of these remarks, I am concerned about the future of the Department of Agriculture.

I consider that no department of the executive branch of our Government has contributed to the growth, prosperity, and influence of the United States in world affairs as much as the Department of Agriculture.

I will not take time to go further into detail on Earl Butz' accomplishments, but surely a great agricultural State like Indiana has not been stupid in employing him these many years to educate and train its youth for rural living and the operation of its farms.

Now I am genuinely concerned that the continual wrangling in the Congress, the constant striving for position among farm organizations, the growing power of groups desirous of taking over functions of the Agriculture Department and the incessant stream of abuse heaped upon the Secretary—even a secretarial appointment—will, in the not distant future, bring on the fragmentation of this Department to which America and the world owe so much.

I did not agree with President Nixon's proposal to abolish the Department and assign its work to other agencies of government and I was delighted when in announcing the appointment of Dr. Butz as Secretary he stated that he had changed his mind in this matter.

But, there are those who would assign the food programs—school lunch, food stamp, and others—to the welfare program.

There are those who would assign our export business to the Commerce Department and others, many others who have been working around here this week, who would delegate controls over land use to the Interior Department and our environmental agencies.

I am very much interested to see that some of those people have been working their utmost to bring about the defeat of Earl Butz to the secretaryship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield myself another 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, Earl Butz is dedicated to the continuation of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and its worthwhile functions even if some of his critics are not.

He is dedicated to the continuation of our agricultural colleges, extension services, experiment stations and 4-H clubs.

Does that disqualify him for being Secretary of Agriculture?

In my opinion, that alone would be sufficient reason to vote for his confirmation.

And, finally, the question is asked, what will he do to improve farm income when he becomes Secretary?

Well, let me say right now, he cannot do anything without the approval of the President.

No one could foresee the tremendous corn crop of this year or the heavy yield of wheat in other competing countries or the fact that Northern United States and Southern Canada did not have a frost until early November—an unheard of situation.

Nor could we foresee that the strike of dockworkers would lower the price of export crops materially for the fall period when shipping was needed most.

There has also been resentment over the fact that the administration has, over the protest of the Agriculture Department, seen fit to impound certain funds which might have helped the situation even though those funds are only a small part of the total amount impounded.

I realize that the reason for this has been the rapid increase of costs—the same reason that prompted President Lyndon Johnson to suspend money for highway construction for a period of time during his term of office.

If our conferees can bring back to us a decent and fair tax bill, if we can enact phase II legislation which is fair to the people of this country and is effective in controlling skyrocketing costs, then it will be possible to release a considerable amount of the funds which have been withheld over a more recent period of time.

I am assured that with the passage of adequate legislation and the installation of a Secretary of Agriculture every effort will be made without delay to improve the conditions so important not only to the welfare of our farm people but to the welfare of all people in this country.

Congress must do its part and do it fairly.

Trying to handicap the President in his efforts to create better conditions in this country, and the whole world for that matter, is not justified.

President Nixon has made many mistakes and I have protested them.

He has also done many things right and I applaud them.

Like other people, he has many traits but two of them stand out to his credit.

He is not a fraud cat.

He keeps his promises.

I am confident that with the approval of Earl Butz as Secretary of Agriculture conditions on the farm and in our rural areas will improve.

I have read the minority report prepared by my friend, the junior Senator from Minnesota, and I cannot agree with his conclusions.

I trust he does not panic the community centers of this Nation by calling attention to the huge supply of food with which this country is favored.

As I have stated, the President is the head of the executive branch of Government.

The President has been in charge of this department of Government since it was founded in 1862 under Abraham Lincoln, and since that time no President of

the United States has been denied the right to select his own Secretary of Agriculture. To deny him the right now to choose his principal aides—or Cabinet officers—would establish a precedent that would not only make it more difficult for President Nixon, but for any future President, as well.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point a biography of Earl Butz, his accomplishments while Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for 3 or 4 years in the 1950's, and a letter which came to me at my request under date of November 24, 1971, strongly in favor of invoking the Taft-Hartley Act in the dock strike, but that has been done since I received this letter.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EARL L. BUTZ

PERSONAL

Address: Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.

Age: 62.

Marital Status: Married—2 children.

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

B.S.A., Purdue University (Lafayette), 1932 and Ph.D., Purdue University, 1937.

PROFESSIONAL AND GOVERNMENT EXPERIENCE

1937 to Present—Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.

Dean, Department of Continuing Education, School of Agriculture.

Professor, Agricultural Economics Department.

1954-1957—Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

1935-1936—Research Economist: Federal Land Bank, Louisville, Kentucky.

1933-1934—Farmer, Noble County, Indiana.

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Research Economist, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

Research Staff, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Director, Standard Life Insurance Co. of Indiana.

Director, J. I. Case Co., Racine, Wisconsin.

Director, Ralston Purina Co., St. Louis, Missouri.

Director, International Minerals & Chemical Corp., Chicago, Illinois.

Director, Farm Foundation, Chicago, Illinois.

Director, Foundation for American Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Chairman, U.S. delegation FAO, Rome. (1955 & 1957)

Member, American Farm Economics Assn. (Vice President 1948)

Member, American Society of Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers, Indiana Academy of Social Sciences. (Vice President 1948)

Member, International Conference of Agricultural Economists.

OTHER

Author (book) The Production Credit System for Farmers (1944).

Accomplishments of Dr. E. L. Butz while he served as Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Foreign Agriculture in the U.S. Department of Agriculture from August 2, 1954 to July 31, 1957.

Foreign agriculture

1. Helped work out the first PL-480 program with Turkey on November 15, 1954, and thus laid the background for shipments of surplus farm products which, from that day to this, have totaled about \$20 billion.

2. Expanded the Agricultural Attache service overseas from 50 to 66 and brought the attache reporting system back within the USDA.

December 1, 1971

3. Worked as liaison man for the USDA with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN and was instrumental in getting a U.S. citizen, Dr. Vince Cardon, elected as Director-General of the FAO.

#### Marketing

1. Supervised the largest expansion in the number of Federal Milk Marketing Orders in USDA history. There were 49 orders when Butz took office, 74 when he left.

2. Assisted in the development and strengthening of dairy cooperatives through modifications in milk order programs.

3. Helped rationalize the price relationships of various dairy products to one another through adjustments in milk market orders and price support programs.

#### General

1. Developed good relationships inside and outside the USDA with the various persons affected by government programs.

2. As a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, worked consistently to move government stocks of commodities into use, at home and abroad.

3. Traveled and spoke widely and effectively in support of Administration programs in and outside of agriculture.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
November 24, 1971.

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: In response to your request I am pleased to clarify and expand upon my views on several important issues.

#### FOOD PROGRAMS

I fully support President Nixon's pledge to eliminate poverty related hunger and malnutrition in this Nation.

Since the President's historic "Hunger Message" on May 6, 1969, the accomplishments comprise the largest and most successful nutritional undertaking in all history.

I will give high priority, as Secretary of Agriculture, to continued USDA efforts to reach the President's goal. I will energetically work toward improvements in the programs to feed needy families and to improve the nutritional health of this Nation's children.

#### FARM BARGAINING

Farm bargaining is an important marketing tool for farmers and ranchers. There clearly is need for legislation to strengthen the ability of qualified agricultural cooperative associations to bargain in good faith with handlers for contract terms to improve net farm income.

The Administration has, in testimony before the House and the Senate, supported the principles of H.R. 7597, the National Agricultural Marketing and Bargaining Act of 1971 and companion legislation in the Senate. I completely endorse the Administration's position in this regard.

#### DOCK STRIKES

America's farmers are suffering tragic, needless losses as the result of the current work stoppages at East Coast and Gulf ports and the recent strike, not yet finally settled, on the West Coast.

Last year the production from one out of every four acres was exported. This year the fall harvest is nearly over. Farm products are now backed up on farms, elevators, warehouses, on trucks, rail cars, and barges. Immediate losses are huge, and permanent loss of export markets threatens chances for future farm prosperity.

As Secretary of Agriculture, every resource at my command will be brought to bear upon an effort to open up the ports. The disastrous conditions currently affecting farmers call for immediate Taft-Hartley Act relief.

Further, I would do everything in my power to obtain legislation designed to elim-

inate future costly transportation stoppages. The Administration has proposed legislation under the Public Interest Protection Act which is designed to accomplish this very purpose. This legislation is currently before the Congress. I will support it vigorously.

There must be a better way. We must find it.

#### RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Farmers are a part of the Nation's rural community. They and the others who live in rural America deserve good housing, health care, schools, churches, and all other community services. Rural prosperity is essential if we are going to have thriving rural communities. We must have an expansion of rural economic activity as well as an improvement in farm net income.

I am strongly in favor of an active rural development program designed to strengthen rural communities.

Improved job opportunities in rural areas cannot only reverse the migration to overly congested cities, but will allow smaller farmers to earn off-farm income. This can permit farm families to strengthen their farm operation and continue to live on the farm.

#### FARM INCOME

I will lead a crusade for higher realized net farm income for farmers. I state this unequivocally. We need several tools, including, but certainly not limited to:

The tearing down of export barriers, especially in the Common Market and Japan.

A vigorous, realistic use of the Public Law 480 program. This is a great humanitarian program which has served the interests of the hungry of the world, and, at the same time benefited this Nation's farmers.

Steps to improve the price of grains. As I have already stated, the price of corn is too low. As soon as possible after confirmation I will recommend action.

I intend to implement the greatest agricultural market development program in all history. The basis for good farm prices is expanding demand at home and abroad.

The beginnings of a grain trade with the Communist bloc has been announced. I will do everything possible to develop this great market potential.

#### GENERAL

I consider it a great honor to be nominated to the Cabinet as Secretary of Agriculture.

At the same time I fully recognize the great challenges one faces in that position. It is a difficult job. I have no illusions about that.

But I can also see great opportunities. Opportunities to serve this Nation's farmers who have, through their fabulous productivity, contributed so much to our standard of living. Opportunities to serve this Nation's people in all walks of life, consumers, conservationists, the young, the old, the needy, and the affluent. The programs of the United States Department of Agriculture serve every citizen of this Nation in a number of significant ways.

I am most grateful, Senator Aiken, for your wise counsel and invaluable assistance.

Sincerely,

EARL L. BUTZ,  
Secretary-Designate.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for yielding. I want to express appreciation to the Democrat side of the aisle for granting me 6 or 7 minutes to speak in opposition to the confirmation of Dr. Earl Butz as Secretary of Agriculture. I sought, in vain, to obtain a little time from the Republican side, and this even though I have sat on this side of the aisle for 27 years.

Mr. President, it is not easy for me as

a lifelong Republican and a Member of the Senate for many years, to oppose the confirmation of a Cabinet member nominated by a Republican President of the United States. I do so only because of the strong conviction I have regarding this nominee, Dr. Earl Butz. My opposition to his confirmation I believe is in the best interests of both the farmer and the Republican Party.

Unquestionably, Dr. Butz is an honorable decent person. His thinking, his views, and policies with respect to agriculture, however, are so different from my own and, I believe so different from the people I have the honor to represent, that I feel I have no alternative but to vote against his confirmation.

Ever since I first knew Dr. Butz, and that was when he was Assistant Secretary of Agriculture under Ezra Taft Benson, his views on farm programs, and particularly price support programs, were for low price supports or none at all. In the hundreds of speeches he has made since that time, I can find no indication that his thinking has changed.

Fortunately, dairy commodities, tobacco, rice, and peanuts have high fixed mandatory supports. No matter what the thinking of the Secretary of Agriculture may be, there is little he can do to change these programs. This is also true of the present cotton program. The present farm legislation with respect to other field crops, and particularly grain, is very flexible and leaves great discretion with the Secretary of Agriculture. If he wanted to, any Secretary of Agriculture could make these price support programs even far more ineffective than they are now. Thus the Secretary of Agriculture has vast authority to affect the income level and economic well being of millions of farm families. No doubt this is why the opposition to Dr. Butz' confirmation is so strong and widespread in my area. He has the power to make or break the average farmer. No doubt this is why the opposition to Dr. Butz is so strong in North Dakota.

I have noted that farmers involved in almost every other kind of production, too, are very deeply concerned about the confirmation of Dr. Earl Butz. No doubt a part of this is due to his sizable interests and influence in such huge concerns as Ralston-Purina which are not only processors of feed and food, but are also deeply involved in farm production itself. No small or average-type farmer can hope to compete against any huge corporation in the farming business, particularly when some of their other operations are profitable and they can take a writeoff on any farm loss they may have.

Mr. President, all three of the general farm organizations in North Dakota—the Farmers Union, the Farm Bureau, and the NFO—the State Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives, and many other organizations have advised me of their opposition to the confirmation of Dr. Butz. Of the 208 telegrams and 54 letters I have received thus far from North Dakota alone, only two telegrams expressed support for his confirmation. As their representative in the U.S. Senate, I could hardly ignore this almost unanimous request to vote against this confirmation.



S 20000

Mr. President, I lived on a farm 47 years of my life or until I came to the U.S. Senate. I never had any other interests or investments, nor do I now. Many people have thought of me as strictly a wheat farmer. Actually my farming operations were quite diversified. While wheat was usually the major crop, for a long period of time I had a sizable dairy herd and I was also in the business of raising hogs and sheep. You could hardly find a more diversified farming operation in any State than mine was. While I am no longer a farm operator, all three of my sons are actual North Dakota farmers and they, too, have no other interest except in their farming operations.

With this kind of a background, Mr. President, I could not help but have a deep and continuing interest in agriculture. May I repeat again what I have said on the Senate floor before—I am a farmer first, and a Republican second.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I compliment the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for the excellent and very apt statement which he has made. As he knows, my father, who is a small farmer in southwestern Oklahoma, and I for many years followed the wheat harvest up to the State of North Dakota, and I know of the farming interests in his State, which are very similar to my own. He certainly expressed my own opinion on this nomination, and also that of the farmers of my State.

Mr. President, I also want to announce that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would be here to make a statement at this time against the nomination except that he is in the conference on the tax and campaign financing bill. He does oppose the nomination of Mr. Butz and will make his principal statement in the morning.

Now I am glad to yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON).

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Oklahoma. May I first say to the Senate that I hope every Senator, prior to voting on this matter, will read the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota, who for many years, I have felt, was not only an outstanding representative of the American farmer, but represents all that is best from the standpoint of experience and character in the U.S. Senate.

Anyone interested in the future of those millions of Americans who continue their bitter struggle to live on our land, so as not to be shunted into the cities to probably increase that already high unemployment that is currently characteristic of those later areas, should view with grave reservation this nomination of Dr. Earl L. Butz to be the next Secretary of Agriculture.

I do not question the fact Dr. Butz really believes his oft-announced concepts of how the business of farming should operate. Based upon the record, as well as the testimony of this nominee, however, it is all too clear that if he obtains the authority to carry out these

concepts, and if he is sincere in what he has been saying for many years, his appointment can only perpetuate and accelerate the price-depressing policies now characteristic of the farm programs currently backed by this administration.

This in turn can only further erode the confidence of agriculture, in any Federal farm programs; and this at a time when voluntary participation is being constantly stressed by the Department of Agriculture.

It is no secret that the career of Dr. Butz has been one which has consistently displayed an orientation in favor of the industrial processors, not the agricultural producers. Apparently his definition of efficiency is one which will drive another million farmers out of business by 1980; and this without regard to the individual efficiency of many family-size farms. I say this because under his policies the producer of agriculture products will be even more at the mercy of the great industrial processors.

The record also shows that, in his search for what he terms a "free market," Dr. Butz would favor a further decrease in any Government involvement in the farm economy.

Even without his direction, this current agricultural year well illustrates what happens to the individual producer if the Department of Agriculture works one side of the fence, but not the other.

Acting on what he said was "in the national interest," last year the former Secretary of Agriculture, who has now become a vice chairman of the corporation which Dr. Butz has represented for many years, called for heavily increased planting of feed grains so as to avert the anticipated shortage resulting from corn blight. When this expected development did not materialize, however, the consequent increased supply of corn and other grains glutted the market to the point where prices were driven down to the lowest levels in many years; and are still down.

Because of the failure to date of this administration to increase the loan support level for corn and other feed grains—and this is what many of us pointed out, Mr. President, would happen if we gave up our rights and gave them to the Secretary of Agriculture last year—individual farmers are now being penalized for responding to this "maximum production" call issued by their Government.

In other words, their cooperation with the Department of Agriculture has cost them heavily in income; and nobody can deny that.

Should not the Secretary of Agriculture be one whose record, not whose statements around the time of his request for confirmation, demonstrates that his primary interest is in the welfare of the farmer, not in the further progress of the giant verticle corporations whose profits increase in proportion to the lower prices they are able to obtain from the agricultural producers?

The facts presented above are well known to every segment of agriculture including most farmers.

The latter ask why should there not be just one member of President Nixon's

Cabinet—just one—who represents the producers of the industry that employs more Americans than any other; and this apprehension is probably the chief reason for the overwhelming opposition to the nomination of Dr. Butz by the farmers of my State.

Mr. President, I represent a State in which we have two great cities, although agriculture is our largest industry. We will find Senators representing great cities who will come in here and vote for measures to crush the farm income of the remainder of rural agriculture. But, if it is any consolation to them, they will be the ones who will, in turn, be demanding more money for the people who they are demanding move off the land into the ghettos, for which they are coming in here and asking for millions and millions of dollars more in public welfare support.

From Missouri, I have received nine communications in favor of Dr. Butz and 343 against his appointment.

As but one illustration of their views, let me quote a letter received from the

From Missouri, I have received nine gentleman who is generally considered the No. 1 farmer of Missouri, Mr. Fred V. Heinkel, president of the Midcontinent Farmers Association:

With regard to the confirmation of Dr. Earl Butz for Secretary of Agriculture, it is our belief that Dr. Butz should not be confirmed by the Senate for Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

I have not had a single MFA member or farmer tell me that he favors Dr. Butz as Secretary. I am not sure that all of these people know Dr. Butz's "track record" as we do, but the one thing they know and shall never forget: He was part and parcel of the disastrous Benson programs in the '50's.

Missouri farmers also know that since 1950 the Nation's farm population has dropped from 25.1 million—16.5 percent of the population—to 9.7 million in 1970—4.8 percent of our population.

Where have these people gone? Any one who is interested in the problems of the cities can tell you where they have gone. In the main they have flocked to our cities in the effort to earn a living, thereby contributing to the sharp increases in the unemployment characteristic of recent years; and this, of course, has contributed to the dramatic rise in the number of people who have been forced to go on welfare in order to survive.

Dr. Butz, however, does not view the human tragedy of this development as any "new trend;" rather one which has been going on during most of this century, and one which he excepts, and presumably advocates, to survive.

In a speech May 2, 1957, entitled, "The New Look in Agriculture," Dr. Butz said:

Machines will continue to displace men on our farms. We will produce more with fewer firms and with fewer workers than at present.

The man who represents or is supposed to represent our farmers in the Cabinet of any administration should be a man who recognizes the important social values inherent in the family-size farm—human beings should be on his mind, not machines.

December 1, 1971

Another Missouri farm leader, Oren Lee Staley, of Rea, Mo., president of the National Farmers Organization, summarized the concern of our farmers as follows:

The Senate, in voting on confirmation, will be making a choice on the kind of agriculture and rural America our country wants to encourage. This crucial decision, in our judgment, is the most important single farm vote in this Congress. Farmers everywhere are deeply upset over the selection of Earl Butz and hope the Senate will not cast a vote against them. We, therefore urge you to vote against the confirmation of Dr. Butz.

Finally, Mr. President, again it is the record that really counts. So let us look at that record.

Statements made by Dr. Butz, from the time of his service under Ezra Taft Benson as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in 1957 up until a few months ago, reflect his considered attitude toward the enforcement of programs for which he would be responsible; programs such as the food stamp program, a program which gives food to little children and to aged and ill people all over the United States, and the Packers and Stockyards Act.

As late as April 26, before an agriculture and marketing seminar in Minneapolis, Dr. Butz described as "fadism" the recent concern expressed by Members of the Senate toward the problems of hunger and malnutrition in the United States.

In the same speech which was referred to in an editorial in the Washington Post this morning, he described the food stamp program—now get this—as "just short of ridiculous in some parts of the country."

What a statement for the Secretary of Agriculture to make. I remember years ago when the Secretary of Labor appointed by the late, great President Eisenhower was a plumber, and everyone said, "Imagine a plumber in the Cabinet of the President of the United States."

But I heard the president of the A.F. of L. take those comments apart, when he named the Secretary of Defense and asked, "Who does he represent?" He named the Secretary of the Treasury, and asked, "Who does he represent?" And he went right through the Cabinet.

Then the head of the A.F. of L. said:

Can't we have one person in the Cabinet who represents the tens of millions of Americans in labor organizations? And if there is one in the Cabinet, should he not normally be the Secretary of Labor?

Well, Mr. President, are we not in exactly the same situation today? Is there to be no one in the Cabinet of the President of the United States who represents the producers of the farm products which represent the food that is needed by everybody in this land?

I know there are those who do not think so, and I know there are those who are planning to eliminate any representation.

I have in my hand the Kiplinger Agricultural Letter, the last one out, dated November 26, 1971, and it reads:

Here's something farmers should get firmly set in their minds.

Dep't of Agriculture is on the way out . . . probably this decade.

One way or another USDA is going to eased out of existence.

Then NO gov't agency will speak exclusively to or for farmers.

Oh, Nixon says USDA will be kept . . . as a major gov't department with full cabinet status. Made the announcement at White House briefing for newsmen when he nominated Earl Butz to be next Sec. of Agriculture.

This makes great election year talk . . . designed to placate farmers. And undoubtedly true for the time being. USDA will be kept for a while.

Then the letter says:

So . . . a change in strategy regarding USDA. Keep it now . . . but set stage for future abolition by city congressmen.

Mr. President, so that I will not be accused in any sense of taking anything out of context, I ask unanimous consent that this part of the Kiplinger Agricultural Letter of November 26, 1971, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KIPLINGER AGRICULTURAL LETTER,  
Washington, D.C., Nov. 26, 1971.

DEAR SIR: Here's something farmers should get firmly set in their minds. Dep't of Agriculture is on the way out . . . probably this decade. One way or another USDA is going to be eased out of existence. Then NO gov't agency will speak exclusively to or for farmers.

DEAR SIR: Here's something farmers should get firmly set in their minds.

Dep't of Agriculture is on the way out . . . probably this decade.

One way or another USDA is going to be eased out of existence.

Then NO gov't agency will speak exclusively to or for farmers.

Oh, Nixon says USDA will be kept . . . as a major gov't department with full cabinet status. Made the announcement at White House briefing for newsmen when he nominated Earl Butz to be next Sec. of Agriculture.

This makes great election year talk . . . designed to placate farmers. And undoubtedly true for the time being USDA will be kept for a while.

But study Nixon's remarks . . . analyze . . . dig for the true meaning:

He will rejigger USDA to represent ONLY farmers. Sounds great on the surface. It's just what many farmers have wanted for a long time.

Agriculture will be stripped of NONfarm programs and functions. A proposed Dep't of Community Development will acquire rural housing, water & sewer programs . . . probably Rural Electrification Administration. Forest Service and SCS will go to proposed Dep't of Natural Resources. These moves will be made via the legislative route . . . perhaps next year. Later on, meat & poultry inspection will be combined with Food & Drug. Food stamps and school lunch will move to HEW or whatever succeeds it.

Only bare bones will be left: ASCS to administer farm programs, a farm statistics group, plus some research . . . economic, crop, livestock.

Can a stripped-down USDA survive as a major gov't department over the long pull if its only function is to serve commercial farmers?

Odds are definitely against it. Will be very hard to justify cabinet status for a dep't that serves only 500,000 to 600,000 farmers. Congress will take a dim view as it becomes even more urban-oriented.

Question: Isn't farming part of commerce? The "manufacturing" and marketing of food and fiber. Agriculture is now "another industry," not a "way of life," it's argued, or something needing special treatment.

So why not represent it that way in gov't? Have a farm agency within the Commerce Dep't or whatever dep't is to represent business. Some observers predict this is the route Agriculture will be following. Say Nixon is still for it, but realizes farm votes will be hard to get if he continues to say it. So . . . a change in strategy regarding USDA. Keep it now . . . but set stage for future abolition by city congressmen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 15 minutes allotted the Senator have expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I ask for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. I yield the Senator 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In May 1957, as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, in connection with hearings on a bill designed to prevent monopolistic practices in the meat processing industry, Dr. Butz appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly.

An article based on those hearings appeared last week in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. This article asserted that Dr. Butz "squelched" an investigation of alleged price fixing of a major grocery chain in 1956.

The article then goes on to state, in part:

Butz acknowledged halting an inquiry into Safeway Stores, Inc. in testimony before a Senate Subcommittee in 1957. A subordinate testifying before the same subcommittee said that there was evidence of federal law violations by Safeway in its meat-buying operations in California.

Sources interviewed today recalled the Safeway inquiry and said that Butz stopped the investigation after it had uncovered specific information about methods allegedly used by Safeway to control beef prices.

Such tactics would have been in violation of the federal Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921.

The source asked not to be identified but said that he would testify about the matter before a Senate committee if asked. He said that documents locked up in the Department of Agriculture would confirm his contention.

I do not know whether these assertions are true or are not true. They have been placed on the public record, however, and, therefore, should be looked into carefully prior to final consideration of this nomination.

The farmers of America already have enough problems in their struggle to make ends meet; and it would seem that this is hardly the time to have as their representative in the Cabinet of the President of the United States one whose statements, whose record, and some sources of income demonstrate with clarity that his primary interest has been with those who profit most when farm prices are at their lowest.

It is for the foregoing reasons that I will vote against confirmation of the nomination of Dr. Butz, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles from the November 26, 1971, St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the December

S 20002

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

December 1, 1971

1, 1971, Washington Post be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Nov. 26, 1971]

## BUTZ HALTED PRICE STUDY

(By Lawrence E. Taylor)

WASHINGTON, Nov. 26.—Earl L. Butz, nominated as Secretary of Agriculture, squelched an investigation into alleged price-fixing by a major grocery chain in 1956 when he was an assistant Secretary of Agriculture, records showed today.

Butz acknowledged halting an inquiry into Safeway Stores, Inc., in testimony before a Senate subcommittee in 1957. A subordinate testifying before the same subcommittee said that there was evidence of federal law violations by Safeway in its meat-buying operations in California.

Butz, who left the department in 1958 to join the faculty at Purdue University, has been criticized for his close ties to big businesses with agricultural interest.

At the time of his nomination to the top agriculture job by President Richard M. Nixon, Butz was on the boards of several agriculture business firms, including Ralston Purina Co. of St. Louis. He said he had resigned from those positions.

Sources interviewed today recalled the Safeway inquiry and said that Butz stopped the investigation after it had uncovered specific information about methods allegedly used by Safeway to control beef prices.

The sources told the Post-Dispatch evidence indicated that each week Safeway buyers allegedly set a top price that the company would pay for beef.

This price allegedly was passed along to buyers for other California retailers and commercial outlets and allegedly resulted in a ceiling on beef throughout the state, the sources said.

Such tactics would have been in violation of the federal Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921.

One source, close to the investigation, recalled that the inquiry was begun after California cattlemen and beef producers had complained to the Department of Agriculture.

The source said that the inquiry, conducted by the department's packers and stockyards division, had been under way for two or three months when Butz, in a handwritten directive, ordered it halted.

"The next step (in the investigation) would have been to question them (Safeway executives) and get documents, and to question some of those alleged to be in the conspiracy," the source said.

The source asked not to be identified but said that he would testify about the matter before a Senate committee if asked. He said that documents locked up in the Department of Agriculture would confirm his contention.

In addition to price-fixing, the investigation had sought to determine whether Safeway's ownership of livestock feed lots had enabled it to unfairly influence meat prices, the source said.

Butz, testifying before the Senate judiciary subcommittee on antitrust and monopoly in May 1957, discussed only the feedlot aspects of the investigation.

His initial answers to questions by subcommittee members about the Safeway matter were vague. His memory improved, however, when Lee D. Sinclair, director of the section making the investigation, appeared before the subcommittee.

Sinclair testified that at the time Butz halted the inquiry, "we felt . . . there was sufficient evidence to warrant a full-scale investigation; that the facts indicated a violation (of the law)."

Butz had testified earlier that the investigation was stopped "because we had no conclusive evidence, as far as I know, and as of this date we have no conclusive evidence that this practice does in fact depress prices."

He said that the matter was "much broader than Safeway" and dealt with questions of whether retail chains could own feedlots and meat packing plants.

For that reason, the investigation was ended and the matter was turned over to an agricultural economist for study, Butz said.

Sources interviewed today, said, however, that the normal pattern in such cases would have been for the department to order an economic study while the price-fixing inquiry was continued.

If sufficient evidence of law violations had been uncovered, the matter would have been referred to an Agriculture Department hearing examiner, the source said. If the examiner had found Safeway guilty, a cease-and-desist order could have been issued.

Publicity resulting from the hearing would have been embarrassing to the company, which at the time was one of the largest retail grocery chains in California.

Safeway, in a letter filed with the antitrust and monopoly subcommittee in 1957, denied any wrongdoing. The company did not discuss its meat-buying practices, however, and the matter was not raised at the hearing.

The sources said, however, that word of the departmental investigation and the resulting economic study apparently leaked back to Safeway and the alleged price-fixing was stopped.

The investigation was begun and halted when Ezra Taft Benson was Secretary of Agriculture. Sources said that there was no indication that Benson had been involved directly in the decision to terminate the inquiry.

Butz has been challenged because of his close identification to Benson's policies. Opponents of his confirmation to the Agriculture post have said that 38 Senators probably would vote against him when the nomination reached the Senate floor. Butz was approved by the Senate Agriculture Committee 8 to 6.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 1, 1971]

## FARMERS AND POLITICS

The most fascinating aspect of the fight in the Senate over the nomination of Earl Butz to be Secretary of Agriculture is why the Nixon administration got into it in the first place. Mr. Butz is hardly what you would call popular in the farm states, except among the really big farmers and farm corporations, and substantial numbers of Republican voters live in those states. His nomination has made almost all of the Republican senators from those states squirm and some of them, normally staunch supporters of the President, have already said they will vote against confirmation. On the other side of the aisle, however, the Democrats are having a field day. Mr. Butz is so easy for them to shoot at that some of them are toying with the idea of voting to confirm his nomination so they will have him around for a target next fall.

The complaint against Mr. Butz, as we understand it, is threefold. He is a symbol, as well as an advocate, of what has become known as agribusiness—the takeover of the food production system from beginning to end by large corporations. The second count in the complaint is that he is out of step with even this administration's efforts to aid the poor; last spring he called the food stamp program "so generous, so extensive—that it's just short of ridiculous in some parts of this country" and said the President's welfare program is "so far out that even the Democrats in Congress won't buy it." The third

count is that he is simply insensitive—he seems to regard the current concern about pollution and the environment as a passing fad.

With that kind of record behind him, Mr. Butz was certain to run into trouble on Capitol Hill. The farm problem is one to which many senators are peculiarly sensitive, partly because some of their constituents are farmers and partly because they know the nation doesn't really have a program or a policy to deal with it. Congress simply hasn't decided yet what to do about farming—whether to try to save some of the old small farms, or to let the whole food production cycle slide into a big business operation, or to find a middle road. On that point, the Senate might be better advised to debate what the policy ought to be instead of who the Secretary of Agriculture should be. Mr. Butz, whether the new secretary or dean of an agriculture school, isn't going to establish the nation's policy himself.

As a general rule, Presidents ought to be able to get Senate confirmation of those men and women they want in their cabinets as long as the nominees have honorable records and possess some qualifications for the job. Cabinet members, after all, are the President's hand-picked advisers and administrators. Even so, we can understand why some senators, Republicans as well as Democrats, don't want Mr. Butz to become the President's key adviser on farm policy. What we don't understand is why the President wants him—particularly when his choice so embarrasses some of his best friends in the Senate. And that leads us to wonder whether the President knew as much about Mr. Butz when he made the nomination as he knows now. If he did, it seems to us that he unnecessarily picked a fight which will hurt him politically even if he wins it. If he didn't everybody—except the Democrats who want to run against Mr. Butz next November—might be better off if the nomination were withdrawn.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from New York.

New York is one of the greatest agricultural producing States in the Union, and the greatest consuming population of any area in the United States is in the New York City area.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is my intention to support the confirmation of the nomination of Dr. Earl Butz to be Secretary of Agriculture. I wish to make certain points clear in that regard.

First, the nomination we are considering is a Presidential nomination for a Cabinet position. As I stated in my floor statement of October 20, 1971, discussing the Supreme Court nominations—where I set my criteria for such confirmations—I am prepared to vote to confirm, subject to substantiality and integrity, nominations of Cabinet or similar officials made by the President precisely because these appointees should be, insofar as possible, those the President chooses and who will work with and for him. As to Dr. Butz, I must be motivated importantly by the fact that the President wants him as the Secretary of Agriculture.

Second, I do not have to agree with all of Dr. Butz' philosophy and attitude toward the programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.

I do not suppose one could agree fully with any honest man. But I would have to be satisfied that he reasonably meets the policy requirements which I feel are demanded for American agriculture—



December 1, 1971

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 20003

again bearing in mind that the President wants him and that, therefore, if I can, I should give the President the man he wants. This is a job in which the President has more of a right to have his chosen assistant.

My deep interest is in the hunger and nutrition programs—in the school lunch program, in the food stamp program, in the school breakfast program and other nutrition programs. I was the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Hunger and Nutrition.

I have had a discussion with Dr. Butz and had it expressly in the light of a speech he gave last April in which he seemed to criticize the programs to which I have just referred, and in which he specifically referred to a trip taken by Senator McGovern to Florida to investigate hunger problems—a trip, incidentally, of which I was a part, as a member of the Senate Hunger and Nutrition Committee.

After discussing this matter with Dr. Butz, I felt that the talk he gave was mainly directed toward the point that we Americans have a tendency, when we are for something to drive it and drive it and drive it until it might become an excessive preoccupation with us, and that we manifest that in our action. I might not agree, but I can understand that it did not necessarily represent a basic policy deficiency so far as his administration of the Department would be concerned.

I now have a letter from Dr. Butz bearing out my conclusion that, under all the circumstances presented, I should support him, and I should like to read the letter into the RECORD. It is addressed to me, and it reads:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
December 1, 1971.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: May I assure you in this letter as I did in our conversation yesterday of my deep and abiding interest in a program that assures that no American will go to bed hungry or the victim of malnutrition.

During the three years of this Administration, the food stamp program and the school lunch program have increased substantially. These programs have my full and enthusiastic support.

I have often stated that U.S. agriculture is so productive and that this country is so affluent that we simply cannot and must not tolerate pockets of malnutrition and hunger.

Moreover, I am convinced that the various food distribution programs administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture can be a positive factor in alleviating the difficult problems of the inner city that plague the population of our larger metropolitan areas.

You may be assured that I will exert every possible effort to see that the abundant production of our American farms finds its way onto the tables and into the school lunches of our more than 200 million citizens.

I look forward to working with you in the implementation of this program.

Sincerely,

EARL L. BUTZ,  
Secretary-Designate.

Mr. President, the efforts of the agricultural organizations in the State of New York—and I have communicated with many of them as to the general policies expressed by Dr. Butz—seem to be in accordance with the future of agriculture and the future of dairying under

the special conditions which obtain in my State. Not that these conditions are unique, but they are conditions which particularly obtain in my State, which is, in fact, one of the leading agricultural and dairy States in the country.

The distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), who has been a great leader of agricultural interests and such a close neighbor to New York State, has expressed the fact that my State, though a very great industrial State, is also a very great farming State, especially dairying.

Mr. President, I will read into the RECORD part of a resolution adopted by the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation in November relating to its views on the work of Dr. Butz and his selection by President Nixon to be Secretary of Agriculture.

The Foundation resolution said:

Resolved, by the Board of Trustees of the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, assembled in its annual meeting November 15, 1971, that we extend congratulations and good wishes to the Honorable Earl Butz upon his selection by President Nixon to be Secretary of Agriculture; and

Express our sincere appreciation for his effective support of the work and objectives of our Foundation during his years of service as a member of our board; and

Look forward to continuing cooperation with Secretary-Designate Butz in his new role, knowing his dedication to combatting hunger, poverty and malnutrition at home and abroad.

For the reasons I have stated I shall support the confirmation of Dr. Butz. I feel on balance the President should have the Secretary of Agriculture he wants for his Cabinet.

I thank my colleague very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. AIKEN. This would be a good place to put in the RECORD the fact that in fiscal 1969 the appropriation for the food stamp program was \$280 million. For fiscal year 1972, 3 years later, it was \$2.2 billion, an increase of 750 percent approximately—I have not figured it out exactly.

One thing that ails the food stamp program in certain places is that it has been expanded faster than we could get administrative help to administer it properly. A 750-percent increase in 3 years does not seem to be too bad for the present Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUGHES). The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I rise to join with many of my colleagues in opposition to the pending nomination. The Senator from New York recounted just now how a man in private life opposed and ridiculed the food stamp program, opposed and ridiculed the committee's nutrition experts going to Florida to find out the absolutely tragic life of the migrant farmworkers in terms of hunger and malnutrition, ridiculed the effort of Senator KENNEDY and others in going to Alaska to look at the absolutely appalling human conditions of the Eskimos and other Alaskan Natives and

how now, "at 3 minutes to midnight," as his attempted confirmation nears, we receive a letter from him indicating that he is really for all of these humanitarian programs after all.

My father was a Methodist minister, and he used to tell me to be wary of deathbed conversions, because they not always meant the way they seemed to appear and occasionally, when a man survives, he forgets the commitments he made at the time of the deathbed conversion.

To suggest that the man whose entire life has been a shining example of being a special pleader for the corporate processing and trade interests in American agriculture, who has spent most of his adult life in a series of activities and pronouncements which have been antagonistic to the family farmer in this country, who says that he now has changed all of those attitudes, has changed all of those associations and all of those beliefs and is suddenly a friend of the American family farmer, I think is asking more of the U.S. Senate than can be expected.

We in the Midwest, in agricultural America, do not think that the family farmer needs any defense. If we talk about efficiency, about productivity, about delivering quality food and nutrition to the American consumer at a reasonable price, the American farmer stands almost alone in the American economy in terms of magnificence of production and efficiency, and for his dedication to hard work.

What is needed is a series of programs to reward him for those efforts. There is very little hope that he will have such programs and such philosophies in the hands of the present nominee should he become Secretary of Agriculture.

Time and time again he has shown that he opposes the very program, the very efforts that are important for a sound family farm agricultural system. That is why he meets with severe opposition from the farm organizations which represent family farmers when he is opposed by farm workers, by rural businessmen, by environmentalists, by nutritionists, by people who want a humane and a just America. He simply does not represent a broad-enough segment of agriculture adequately to serve as Secretary of Agriculture.

An editorial appeared yesterday in the Worthington Globe, one of the finest newspapers in Minnesota. It suggested that Mr. Butz should be made Secretary of Commerce, because that has been his life; that his associations have been found almost exclusively with the large processing and marketing corporations of this country, and that therefore his views and his antagonism to rural family farming life make him a very unwise choice indeed to be Secretary of Agriculture.

I think that this editorial speaks responsibly for the people in rural America who are trying desperately to preserve an enviable way of life and a precious heritage.

Farmers and rural Americans need a Secretary of Agriculture who has a broad outlook on the total needs of agriculture

S 20004

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

December 1, 1971

not someone who admits defeat by saying, "Nothing can reverse the trend."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## EARL BUTZ SHOULD NOT BE CONFIRMED

On Monday Iowa's Sen. Jack Miller cast his vote in the Senate Agriculture committee against the nomination of Earl Butz for Secretary of Agriculture. Miller said he would not vote for a nominee who less than two weeks ago predicted there would be only 600,000 commercial farmers left in America—and that there was nothing any administration could do to reverse that trend. "When it comes to agriculture I feel that my first duty as a senator from Iowa is to stand up for the farmers of Iowa," Miller declared.

With that, it could be said the battle is fought although the issue is not yet decided for farmers through the local region. Every senator from the upper Middle West—Miller and Hughes of Iowa, Mondale and Humphrey of Minnesota, McGovern of South Dakota, Young and Burdick of North Dakota, Nelson and Proxmire of Wisconsin—is in opposition to the Butz nomination. Partisan politics have been somewhat laid aside.

The only major political figure in either the Republican or Democratic parties of the region to support the nomination is Rudy Boschwitz, Minnesota Republican national committeeman, who Sunday said Butz is "an excellent and courageous choice" and who said he is encouraged to advocate Butz after discussions with "a large number of farmers and farm leaders throughout the state."

There is a snobbery in American politics which dictates that no farmer is capable of directing the Department of Agriculture. Farmer-congressman (Minnesota's Ancher Nelsen or Albert Quie as two examples) are ever overlooked and the department has been headed by a succession of lawyers, economists, educators and professional politicians. Not since the "millionaire cabinets" of the late 19th century, however, has it been suggested that a corporation director could be the most effective spokesman for America's farmers.

It is this, precisely, which rankles.

Earl Butz is a man of distinction, ability and achievement. This is indisputable. He both owns stock and has served on the board of directors of some of the best-known corporations of America, among them the Ralston-Purina corporation, the J. I. Case corporation, Stokley Van-Camps and International Minerals and Chemicals. Ultimately, however, the credentials suggest he could more appropriately be nominated for Secretary of Commerce than Secretary of Agriculture. His interests and experience do not suggest him as the nation's first and best spokesman for the men who plow the fields and plant the corn in southwest Minnesota and northwest Iowa.

Nor does his philosophy.

Mr. Butz is persuaded (as was his onetime chief, Ezra Taft Benson) that "there is nothing any administration can do to reverse the trend" from America's tradition of family farms to the phenomenon of but a relative handful of sprawling, corporate farm operations. This judgment may even be correct; many insist that it is.

There is still substantial reason to hope that much that has been good in American agriculture can be preserved, however. The men and women who are on the farms are not ready to capitulate. They are doing battle to preserve an enviable way of life and a precious heritage. They deserve a spokesman and leader with this same will to fight who will give representation to their cause.

Mr. Butz does not even propose to make a significant effort to ease the present plight

of America's farmers. He suggested to the Senate Agriculture Committee that the present 90-cent corn might be made \$1-a-bushel corn. That would still not be a fair return. And for the longterm outlook, Butz has already written off farming operations of the kind we know today. "Nothing can reverse the trend."

It will be a sorry development indeed if Earl Butz should become the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the controversy over President Nixon's nomination of Dr. Earl Butz has focused emphasis on our Nation's increasing need for bold new programs to revitalize rural America. I have declared my opposition to the nomination because I do not believe that Dr. Butz is the man for the job. As you know, the nomination has met severe opposition from farmers, farmworkers, rural businessmen, and environmentalists. Dr. Butz clearly does not represent a broad enough segment of agriculture to adequately serve as Secretary of Agriculture.

I do not question the professional competence or the integrity of Dr. Butz. But I believe his ideas and philosophies regarding the fate of rural America are archaic and disastrous. He has said that we lost a million farmers under Secretary Benson and another million under Secretary Freeman. His own philosophies indicate that he would have this trend continue. But trends toward fewer and larger farms and the movement of millions of people into the crowded cities are not inevitable. These trends have been nurtured and prodded by programs and policies that encourage invasion of agriculture by corporate conglomerates.

In agriculture, as in other sectors, our Nation has tremendous potential for improvement. We can stop the off-farm migration and even move people back into the rural areas if we vigorously work toward those ends. This must be done soon if we are to have anything left out there in rural America to save.

The vast facilities of the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges and universities could be extremely instrumental in improving the situation in rural America, thus improving the entire Nation. Government could help even more with policies that would reward our farmers for their enterprise and productivity. By instituting bold new programs we could encourage new vigor in rural America.

A vital and stable rural America is important to the entire society and economy. Every year our farmers use the natural resources and their own labor and management skills to create new wealth. Their produce abundantly satisfies the food and fiber needs of our society. Portions exported provide a substantial boost to our balance of payments. Every dollar of income returned to farmers for their production turns over in the economy several times to generate more income in other sectors. For these reasons, better farm income is a basic need for improvement of rural America and the entire economy.

In addition to the economic importance of a vital rural America, there are several social and environmental issues which concern the total Nation and are

directly influenced by the well-being of our independent family farmers. Poverty in rural America adds to poverty in urban America. Off-farm migration increases overcrowding of cities. Large corporate landowners, which displace family farmers who have been stewards of the soil for generations, will likely have less regard for the environment and for good soil and water conservation methods. Seldom has a conglomerate shown much concern over the well-being of its farm laborers or the rural community.

A century ago, it became our primary national policy to move people westward into the open lands of the frontier. As a result, our democracy and free enterprise system were enhanced by the development of many small towns, independent businesses and family farms. But, unfortunately, we began neglecting those important entities a few decades ago. It is time to redirect our priorities toward revitalizing the thousands of small communities in rural America which have always been the roots of our Nation's greatness.

The new vitality of rural America must start with good farm income. So far, this administration has shown little interest in that respect. The set-aside program of land retirement is totally inadequate as a system of supply management. Experienced farmers predicted that during signup last winter. This year's vast overproduction and severely depressed wheat and feed grains prices have proven the program's inadequacy.

Several bills have been introduced in efforts to improve the depressed farm price situation. These include S. 2729, which authorizes establishment of a strategic reserve of storable commodities. The reserve would be insulated from the market so it could not hang over market to depress farm prices. Commodities would, however, be available for emergency use in case of drought, pestilence, or other crisis situations.

Another bill, Senate Joint Resolution 172, the Farmers Income Improvement Act of 1971, would provide emergency measures to improve farm income. It would: first, establish a base acreage program for the 1972 feed grain crop; second, establish an additional voluntary acreage diversion program for the 1972 wheat crop, and third, raise loan levels for both the 1971 crops of wheat and feed grains by 25 percent. Together, these proposals would not involve added costs for the Government. Prompt enactment could increase the farm value of the 1971 and 1972 grain crops substantially.

Besides these and other programs needed to solve the immediate problems of our independent family farmers, there are needs for longrun programs. Farmers need informed assistance and strength in marketing their products. They need legal and technical backing to develop bargaining power and workable supply control methods. The Department of Agriculture and the colleges could also be helpful in this area by researching these topics and helping to develop workable programs.

In this session of Congress I introduced two bills that have to do with farm bargaining—the National Agricultural Bar-

December 1, 1971

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 20005

gaining Act of 1971 (S. 726) and the National Agricultural Marketing Act (S. 727). When I first introduced this type of legislation in the 90th Congress, it was a pioneering effort. There had been a little research done but this was a first attempt to see if, through the hearing process, something workable could be developed to give farmers legal authorization for collectively bargaining with processors. I am happy that more progress has been made in this session.

Farmers have often been told that they are free in the marketplace and should stay that way. But too often that freedom turns out to be only a freedom to go broke. The bargaining bills were intended to correct that situation by giving farmers marketing muscle while allowing them to maintain their managerial freedom which has proven itself so efficient.

If rural development is ever to be more than rhetoric, we need to institute several bold new programs which serve a broad segment of agriculture and a broad range of rural needs. Too often in recent years, government and the land grant colleges have served only agribusiness and agribigness, while the broader needs of rural America have been forgotten.

We need a Secretary of Agriculture who will address himself to the needs of our farmers, farm workers and consumers. The record of Dr. Butz epitomizes the agribusiness viewpoint and that viewpoint only. Nothing he has said or done indicates any change in his philosophy.

In each election there are fewer officials elected who have a broad knowledge of agriculture and a feel for the needs of our farmers. Seldom does a presidential aide have a working knowledge of agriculture. During the recent period of national economic problems, the administration made little mention of farming, a sector which is basic to our economy. Facing this situation, I think that we should at least have a Secretary of Agriculture who is responsive to the needs of our farmers. Dr. Butz is clearly not that man and I cannot vote to confirm his nomination to that office.

Mr. President, I continue to receive a phenomenal amount of communications from farmers, rural businessmen and farm organizations in Minnesota opposing the nomination of Dr. Butz. I have selected some of these and I ask unanimous consent to have these messages printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 25, 1971.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,  
Old Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

In a unanimous vote, delegates to the 30th Annual Minnesota Farmers Union Convention approved on Tuesday, November 23, a resolution to strongly and actively oppose the nomination of Dr. Earl Butz as Secretary of Agriculture.

The Resolution read:

"The Minnesota State Farmers Union protests in the strongest possible terms the nomination of Earl Butz as Secretary of Agriculture.

"Dr. Butz, who is now dean of education and chief fund raiser for Purdue University, is also a board member of three huge agribusiness corporations, as well as an Indiana insurance director, plus owning stock in several manufacturing and chemical companies, could not represent the farmers' interests in better agriculture.

"Earl Butz, the man President Richard Nixon wants as Secretary of Agriculture, is against the family farmer. This was proven when he was Assistant Secretary of Agriculture under the Eisenhower-Ezra Taft Benson administration.

"Agriculture is now in a depression equal to the 1930's and needs a strong, open minded Secretary of Agriculture who will fight for and represent the farmer."

NATIONAL FARMERS ORGANIZATION,  
Corning, Iowa, November 19, 1971.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
Old Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: After observing two days of questioning of Dr. Earl Butz at the Agricultural Committee Hearings, we remain firmly convinced that his confirmation as Secretary of Agriculture would be a disaster for farmers. His answers have not satisfied our concerns over his long and close ties to agri-business, his attitudes toward elimination of farmers and the drive by integrators and others to gain control of the food industry, and the conflict of interest arising from his substantial payments as a director of three of the nation's largest agribusiness companies.

He did not satisfactorily answer most of the questions put to him by Senators and other members of Congress of both political parties. These included attempts to determine what he might recommend to raise farm prices, how he would get REA and other department funds released by the White House, how he would tighten poultry inspections, and what he would do to halt the drive by integrators and others to take over farm production.

We feel Senate approval of Dr. Butz would be a vote to abandon an historic commitment to opportunity for people on the land. It would, in effect, ratify a policy to drive people out of agriculture, undermine farm and small business enterprises, and destroy rural towns and cities.

The Senate, in voting on confirmation, will be making a choice on the kind of agriculture and rural America our country wants to encourage. This crucial decision, in our judgment, is the most important single farm vote in this Congress. Farmers everywhere are deeply upset over the selection of Earl Butz and hope the Senate will not cast a vote against them. We, therefore, urge you to vote against the confirmation of Dr. Butz.

Respectfully yours,

OREN LEE STALEY, President.

AMERICANS FOR  
DEMOCRATIC ACTION,

Washington, D.C., November 22, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR: ADA strongly urges the Senate to refuse to confirm Earl L. Butz as Secretary of Agriculture. We believe that the continuing trend toward large-scale corporate agriculture at the expense of the small family farmer is not in the nation's long-term economic interest, and we deplore the nomination of a man for Secretary of Agriculture who has been a devoted spokesman for the agribusiness lobby.

Butz' history of cynical disregard of the welfare of the small farmer—as evidenced by his key role in the farm program of Secretary Ezra Taft Benson in the 1950s—is enough in itself to disqualify him. During that period—and, for that matter, since then—the systems of farm subsidies have operated to assist large farmers far out of proportion to smaller ones, with the so-called

marginal farmers often being left out altogether.

It is time to reverse these policies with new approaches that will link federal subsidy payments with need in rural areas. It is time to dry up the vast sea of rural poverty that exists in every state in the Union. It is time we realized that rural and urban poverty both have flourished out of the misplaced priorities which have given us, among other things, the Vietnam War.

Certainly new priorities will not be advanced with Earl Butz as Secretary of Agriculture.

The needed reversal of these pernicious trends requires a Agriculture Secretary who displays a deep sympathy for the plight of the migrant worker, for the remaining sharecroppers, for Indians who have been dealt the worst farm land in America, and for low-income family farmers everywhere, all of whom live in conditions which are the shame of the nation.

Mr. Butz' statements in the past do not indicate that kind of sympathy. Far from it; his rigidly market-centered outlook would be woefully inadequate to formulate social policies designed to reverse the flow of population from rural America.

Sincerely yours,

LEON SHULL, National Director.

SLEEPY EYE, MINN.,

November 17, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I urge you most strongly to do all in your power to defeat the nomination of Earl Butz for Secretary of Agriculture. He certainly is not the man who would place the welfare of the farmer as his primary task. His background and previous affiliations indicate that.

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs. MARTIN KLICKNER.

SACRED HEART, MINN.,

November 17, 1971.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am opposed to President Nixon's appointment of Earl L. Butz as Secretary of Agriculture.

I urge you to work against confirmation of that post.

We need a sec. of agriculture who understands the problems of rural America. One who understands small family type farming operations. This type of agriculture is the backbone of our great nation.

I strongly feel if agriculture, given its fair share of this nation's wealth, with its roots set firmly in the family farm, will feed into the many branches of our economy. As a result a healthy and prosperous nation will emerge.

We don't need a sec. of ag. who is influenced by conglomerates and large corporate structural farms.

Sincerely,

ROBERT LEROHL.

SLEEPY EYE, MINN.,

November 17, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: In regard to Earl Butz, as a new Secretary of Agriculture, this should be blocked. The statements he has made about the number of farms that he thinks would be plenty, would force all the family type farm operators off.

He is a corporation man, and a slap in the face for the family type farm.

Yours truly,

IVAN KOTTEN.

NOVEMBER 21, 1971.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
The Capitol  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Let me give you a statement from the St. Paul Pioneer Press, Nov. 21, 1971, Focus Section, page 1 and page 4, "Vicious Circle: Pesticides, Pollution, People," by Lewis Patterson.

December 1, 1971.

At a farm marketing seminar in Minneapolis where he was the keynote speaker, Dr. [Earl L.] Butz said that America's overreaction to ecology is fadism. "Environmentalists," he said, "are the greatest single threat to agriculture."

From all the reports which I have read about Mr. Nixon's proposed candidate for the job of Secretary of Agriculture, I have concluded that he is the tool of agri-business, and an instrument in the agriculture school-chemical industry-farm lobby complex.

At a time when America is awakening to the need for increased attention to our ecology, it is unfortunate that we might have at the critical post of Secretary of Agriculture one who is so biased against environmental rehabilitation.

I urge you to cast your vote against Mr. Butz.

Sincerely yours,  
FREDERICK A. FLEMING.

COMMITTEE FOR A PROGRAM  
OF GUARANTEED EMPLOYMENT,  
New York, N.Y., November 20, 1971.

Hon. Senator WALTER MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: President Nixon has nominated Earl Butz as Secretary of Agriculture. We urge you to vote to deny his appointment to that position.

Earl Butz reportedly stated that the Food Stamp program is "so generous and expensive that it is just short of ridiculous in some parts of the country." Total spending for food stamps is about \$2 billion, or less than half the spending by the Department of Agriculture on subsidies for rich farmers for not growing food—a program that Mr. Butz presumably does not consider outrageously generous and expensive.

As a result of Mr. Butz's position on Food Stamps and Welfare (He considers President Nixon's proposed Welfare reform "so way out that even Democrats won't accept it"), we consider him totally unfit for any public office. We therefore urge you to vote to deny confirmation of this appointment.

Sincerely,  
LEONARD SUSSMAN, Chairman.

MADISON, MINN., November 20, 1971.  
Hon. Senator WALTER MONDALE,  
Senate Chambers,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONDALE: A vote for Mr. Butz as Secretary of Agriculture means no vote for you in 1972.

Sincerely,  
CARMEN M. FERNHOLZ, Educator.

P.S. Also please forget any new collective bargaining legislation for agriculture. Agriculture already has all of the tools it needs with the Capper-Volstead Act. Instead put your tremendous intelligence and energy into educating farmers and rural businessmen on the necessity of working together through collective bargaining.

MADILLA, MINN.,  
November 22, 1971.  
Senator WALTER MONDALE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONDALE: Will you please do all you can to stop the appointment of Earl Butz as Secretary of Agriculture?

Yours truly,  
MARK KELSEY.  
MARY L. KELSEY.

AUSTIN, MINN.  
Senator WALTER MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate Office,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I wish you to know that a legion of family farmers appreciate your interest and hard work on behalf of those of us who live on the land as family

farmers. We remember, too, that "the soil is God's greatest material gift to man"—we work at being good stewards of this gift.

We urge you to vote against Mr. Earl Butz as our Secretary of Agriculture. His past efforts have been against the family farmer and the village and town merchants as well.

With much gratitude to you Senator Mondale, I am  
Sincerely,

Mrs. FRED GRAVENISH.

MINNESOTA, MINN.,  
November 19, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We are farmers in Lyon County, Minnesota and do not want Earl Butz as Sec. of Agriculture or any other office in Washington, D.C.

Sincerely,  
Mr. & Mrs. GARFIELD BROUGHTON.

NOVEMBER 17, 1971.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,  
Old Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRITZ: Re approval of Earl Butz as Secretary of Agriculture—if ever we had an opportunity to strike a blow against "Corporate Socialism"—this is it.

"The long habit of not thinking a thing wrong gives it the superficial appearance of being right" Tom Paine.

Earl Butz as Secretary of Agriculture is as wrong as a three dollar bill.

Let's make enough waves to hear it all the way to Minnesota and not just in the news letter.

Best regards always,  
M. B. "PETE" NAGEL.

SLEEPY EYE, MINN.,  
November 17, 1971.

SENATOR MONDALE: I am writing concerning the pending appointment of Earl Butz to the position of Sec. of Agriculture. Because of his relationship to agri-business and vertical integration industries I believe he cannot represent the family farmers' viewpoint. I oppose his nomination. I trust you will consider my letter in your vote.

Respectfully,  
PATRICK A. HOFFMANN.

COMFREY, MINN.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I am writing in regard to the pending appointment of Earl Butz to the position of Secretary of Agriculture. For a man whose background and philosophy is so closely tied to agri-business and vertical integration to be appointed to such an important position seems to us to be an insult to the family farmer.

We urge and hope you will use your influence to block this appointment.

Sincerely,  
ART MATHIOWITZ.

MINNESOTA LAKE, MINN.,  
November 17, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I definitely disapprove of President Nixon's appointment of Earl Butz as Secretary of Agriculture. He has never been for the farmer and certainly won't be now.

He is allied with "Big Brains" especially Ralston Purina the chicken farmers.

Please convey this message of disapproval to the President.

Thank you,  
RONALD KRENGEL.

MORGAN, MINN.,  
November 17, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: In regard to the appointment of Earl Butz, I oppose his appointment as Secretary of Agriculture as he is interested in Big Business and against small Family Type Farms.

Yours truly,  
RAYMOND MARTNOWEZ.

JORDAN, MINN.,

November 17, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR: We are not in favor of Earl Butz for Secretary of Agriculture. We need a man who will help the family farm not big business and corporations.

Sincerely,  
Mr. and Mrs. ERWIN RIEGRAF.

EASTON, MINN.,  
November 18, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR: I think Mr. Earl Butz would be a very poor man in the position of Secretary of Agriculture. The past history of Mr. Butz speaks for itself and he is definitely not concerned about the family farms.

Sincerely,  
GEORGE G. SCHIMEK.

NEW ULM, MINN.,  
November 18, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I am writing in regard to the appointment of Earl Butz to position of Secretary of Agriculture. I urge you to block this appointment. He is too closely related to big business to be of help to the farmers.

Sincerely,  
LINUS GRATHWOHL.

ST. JAMES, MINN.,  
November 17, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Just a few words regarding the appointment of E. Butz as Secretary of Agriculture.

For a man whose background is so closely tied to agribusiness to be appointed to such an important position seems to me to be an insult to the farmer.

I urge and hope you will use your influence to stop this appointment.

Yours truly,  
URBON AUGUSTIN.

SPRINGFIELD, MINN.,  
November 17, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Am writing this in regard to the pending appointment of Earl Butz to Secretary of Agriculture.

As you well know, this man has been with the ones opposed to family farmers.

Please do what you can to prevent his getting this important job.

Thank you.  
Sincerely,  
BERNARD M. FISCHER.

MAHNOMEN, MINN.

Senator MONDALE: We strongly urge the rejection of Earl Butz as Sec. of Agriculture.

If you truly want to help the farmers and rural America support agriculture products at 100% of parity.

Mr. and Mrs. DELMAR SCHOENBORN.

DEAR MR. MONDALE: I am concerned about the appointment of Mr. Butz for Sec. of Agric. I do not believe he is a good man to talk for the average farmer. He is for big business and the large corporations. Please use your leadership to stop him in becoming our next Sec. of Agric. We need a man who will increase price supports on feed grains & wheat now.

Sincerely your,  
VERN PAULSON.

P.S. Corn was 94 cents a bu. at our local elevator today. How long can we continue with these prices.

Sen. WALTER MONDALE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE, If you have the Family Farmer's future at heart—don't put Mr. Butz in as Sec'y of Agriculture.

Mrs. H. J. STRAAD.

December 1, 1971

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 20007

GARDEN CITY, MINN.,

November 17, 1971.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONDALE: This is a followup of the telegram we sent you this morning.

We do not want Earl Butz for Sec. of Agriculture. We want a man with true farming interests in his heart.

We want a man who is interested in family farming, not one interested in corporate or industrial farming.

If the economy of this country is going to improve it will have to start on small farms. If farmers don't have money to put into business things won't improve.

Please give us a Farmer man.

Sincerely,

Mr. &amp; Mrs. HAROLD BELGARD.

MILROY, MINN.,

Nov. 17, 1971.

Hon. Senator MONDALE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I hope you will strongly convey the farmer's mistrust of the new Sec. of Agriculture Earl Butz, elect, to President Nixon.

It seems the producers ought to have a little to say about who is to represent them in this Dept. When they produce the food for the country plus consume 42% of the gross national product.

Thank you.

Mrs. NORMAN DE BLIECK.

ST. PETER, MINN.

We urge you to vote No on the confirmation of Dr. Earl Butz. We just can't stomach his being the Sec. of Agriculture.

Mr. &amp; Mrs. ALTON JACOBSON.

KETTLE RIVER, MINN.,

November 12, 1971.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE, Minnesota 8th District NFO wishes to thank you for visiting us at our State convention this Fall. We appreciate your concern for family farmers and the rural area in general.

We strongly support the position you, Sen. Humphrey and others have taken in opposing the confirmation of Earl Butz as Secretary of Agriculture.

We have long held that the large Agribusiness sector Mr. Butz represents is driving the small farmers off the land. Each farmer thus removed equates into 6 NEW jobs needed (small business men and employees). Minnesota, especially the 8th district, cannot afford additional unemployment or additional debt expenditure to create new jobs in lieu of family farmers.

We further believe Mr. Butz has too great a conflict of interest to represent the farmers of America, and that his past record clearly shows him to be anti farmer.

A Sept. issue of Wall Street Journal reported the three largest Feed-Poultry businesses—Ralston Purina one of them—lost \$225,000.00 this year on poultry. Mr. Butz was a director of Ralston Purina board. Is there any reason to believe that as America's Agricultural Director he would do better? Can the Nation afford to chance this type of "efficiency"?

We are writing this letter to Sen. Humphrey also.

Yours truly,

Mrs. AUGUST KLEGIN.

GARFIELD, MINN.,

November 17, 1971.

WALTER MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: As a farmer and member of the National Farmers Organization, I feel that the appointment of Earl

Butz as Secretary of Agriculture would not be in our best interest. I urge you to use your influence in whatever way possible to prevent his appointment as Secretary.

Sincerely,

LESLIE ANDERSON.

NOVEMBER 17, 1971.

SENATOR WALTER MONDALE: I'm writing in regard to the seating of Earl Butz as our agriculture secretary.

I do not approve of this man because he is for corporate farming and big business. We are small farmers and pay more taxes than big corporate farmers do. We are more efficient in our farming than they are.

We need a secretary that is a defender of the small farmer, not the corporate giants.

JOSEPH DEUTSCH.

NOVEMBER 17, 1971.

SENATOR WALTER MONDALE: I'm writing in regard to the seating of Earl Butz as our agriculture secretary.

I do not approve of this man because he is for corporate farming and big business. We are small farmers and pay more taxes than big corporate farmers do. We are more efficient in our farming than they are.

We need a secretary that is a defender of the small farmer, not the corporate giants.

Mrs. JOSEPH DEUTSCH.

EYOTA, MINN.,

November 17, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I do hear by recommend a no vote for Mr. Butz as U.S. Sec. of Agriculture, because I feel he would be no asset for us individual producers of agriculture products.

Yours truly,

FRED M. GEESE.

KASSON, MINN.,

November 17, 1971.

HONORABLE REPRESENTATIVE WALTER MONDALE: I am very disappointed to have Earl Butz serve as our Secretary of Agriculture.

What we need is a man who will battle for the farmers, and try new ideas, the old ones are out of date. Let's get agriculture rolling once again. It has been in the red far too long.

Your truly,

Mrs. ARTHUR TRYGSTAD.

EAGLE LAKE, MINN.,

November 17, 1971.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,  
Senator from Minnesota, U.S. Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As our farm representative in the Senate of the United States we are very deeply concerned by the possibility of the appointment of such a man as Mr. Butz as our Secretary of Agriculture.

If the appointment should become final, I do believe that the family farm has become a thing of the very past. This man is noted for being for corporation farming and everything against the family farm.

Therefore, we urgently request your undivided attention to seeing that this man not be instated into this office. We very much need a man who can aid our plight not increase it.

Sincerely,

DALE E. SARGENT.

MORA, MINN.,

November 16, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE, because I am the wife of a small farmer and an NFO member I am asking you to protest the appointment of Earl Butz as Secretary of Agriculture. Please demand a hearing so President Nixon is made aware of Mr. Butz involvement in agribusiness.

Thank you for doing all you can to help the small farmers.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ROMAN MILLER.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have spent a good deal of my Senate career working on human problems and trying to do something about them. I am absolutely convinced that the most serious mistake our Nation is making today is to turn its back on a sound rural agricultural economy which makes it possible for rural farm families to get a decent life and livelihood on the farm. I think it is not only cruel, I think it is economic insanity and, if I may say so, there is a certain amount of ignorance and arrogance often found in nonrural America toward the problems we have in rural America.

Time and time again those of us representing farm States have walked the plank to help meet the problems of Americans in the American cities in minimum wages or housing or transportation, and discrimination. Time and time again we have asked our farm constituents to understand why it was necessary to stand up and work for the problems besetting other Americans. It is a tribute to those American farmers that almost always they understood it, and almost always they have stood behind us. Now our workers happen to be family farmers. They are not big corporate farmers. Most of them live at or below poverty levels. They work long and hard hours. They are a prideful people; they are a magnificently productive people. Now they are in trouble, and these farm programs are their minimum wages. This is how they survive. The average farmer with a family of four in Minnesota could go to New York and increase his earnings by 40 percent on welfare. We are not here pleading for some kind of unusual request. We are asking for justice for our family farmers.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Just to be sure that the Senate understands the implications of the last statement made by the able senior Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Texas tells us that farmers in Minnesota can go to Philadelphia, New York, St. Louis, or to the other cities, and get on welfare and by doing so increase their income 40 percent.

Mr. MONDALE. The figure I cite, which has been very carefully checked out, is that the average Minnesota family farmer with a family of four and working a full week, could improve his income by 40 percent by leaving the farm and going to New York City and going on welfare.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as the late great Senator from Oklahoma, Robert Kerr, used to say, "I thought I had heard and seen everything, and I have been to the Dallas Fair twice."

Mr. MONDALE. This country must realize, and I plead with the Senators, to realize, that the only way to have an essential, sound, American agriculture or a sound agricultural society is to have a Secretary of Agriculture who believes in the family farmers.

I think it is a sound and economic principle. I think it makes sense. If we are to have a healthy American agricultural society, the family farmer is entitled to have a friend in that office. Would the



S 20000

Small Business Corporation of this country accept a small business director who announced that there are too many small businesses in the country and we should get rid of some of them? For that matter, would the Secretary of Commerce employ as his assistants those who do not believe in business?

What we need is a man who believes that our constituency has to be served by the Department of Agriculture. We need a man who is fully committed and believes in this effort and offers hope and opportunity to rural America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of West Virginia). Who yields time?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, some 18 months ago the distinguished junior Senator from Washington made a speech in which he said:

Last year, when the Senate was debating a controversial Cabinet nomination, I argued that the President was entitled to wide latitude in the selection of his Cabinet. I took the position that the President, not the Senate, sets the standard of competence and qualifications for his Cabinet. These are the President's men and, barring some extraordinary deficiencies, he is entitled to exercise the Executive responsibility with men of his own choosing. If the voters are unhappy with his selection, their voice will be heard at the next election. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 25, 1970, pp. 4455-4456.)

The Senator who said those words is now a candidate for President and has announced he will vote against the confirmation of Dr. Earl Butz of Indiana as the new Secretary of Agriculture.

What made him change?

I do not know why the Senator from Washington changes his conviction on this issue, but I suspect the sweet smell of presidential politics may have played a part in that switch.

In the case at hand, the President has submitted the name of a man who is clearly qualified by both training and experience to hold this important job.

No one has alleged, much less proved, that he is not competent.

No one has claimed or showed that he is dishonest.

No one challenges his administrative ability or his knowledge of agricultural policy.

No, none of these basic qualifications are in question—only his politics and associations.

It was not too many years ago that many of those who now howl for Earl Butz's scalp were deriding the concept of "guilt by association."

Today they seek to tie Earl Butz to Ezra Benson and roast them both together—and this I submit at worst is "innocence by association."

Earl Butz was a member of President Eisenhower's administration. He served in the Department of Agriculture as an Assistant Secretary. He has been associated with a great university, and he has been in the service of respectable American business firms.

What is so evil about all that?

Is this a standard that many of the Senators who oppose him can themselves meet?

Is "guilt by association" by being part of the Eisenhower Cabinet to be a political stigma against any man who was in Government service in that era?

No, the criticism is basically political. It is highly partisan.

Much of the opposition to Earl Butz, it is clear, has been programed directly from the offices of the Democratic National Committee. Certainly, many Senators have deep and profound beliefs held in sincerity. But look at some of the opposition. In the recent hearings, the first two witnesses were the president of the National Farmers Organization, Oren Lee Staley, and the president of the National Farmers Union, Tony Dechant. Tony Dechant and Oren Staley are both listed as of Tuesday, November 30, as members of the policy council of the Democrat National Committee. Tony Dechant is open about being an active registered Democrat, and while Oren Lee Staley tries to maintain his political neutrality, in Andrew County, Mo., his home community, he is known as an active Democrat. If anything is clear, it is clear that these two skillful Democrat politicians, with an eye toward Election Day, 1972, are opposing Earl Butz for obvious political purposes.

Unfortunately, they are being portrayed or have been portrayed by the media as "nonpartisans" simply looking out for the interests of farmers. These two gentlemen are Democrat partisans, and they should be identified as such.

A man's professional life and reputation are now on the block in the U.S. Senate.

Let us hope the Senate will act in fairness and in decency—not shame itself by embracing a base reason for rejecting an able and honest man.

Mr. President, there has been some comment with reference to the reduction in the number of farms in the Benson era. The Senator from Minnesota is a friend of the former Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman. He probably knows that in 1961 we had a farm population of 14.8 million. It dropped by April 1, 1969, to 10.3 million, a drop of about 30 percent greater than in the Benson era.

I was here during the Freeman years. And I have read the book describing the farmers' worst 7 years, 1961 through 1967. It says that 1967 was the worst of the 7 years. The title is, "The Political Sellout of the American Farmer." It was written by Frank M. LeRoux, who was general sales manager of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service, from February 1961 through September 1966. I remember in 1961 when the President sent a program to Congress on milk production and wheat production. Those were great promises and great programs for the American farmer. I would hope that those who oppose Dr. Butz would read this book, "The Political Sellout of the American Farmer." It describes the farmers' worst 7 years, and describes 1967 as being the worst of the 7. The book sells for \$2. It was a best seller for

a while. It tells about the political sellout of the American farmers by a former Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman.

It says that in all of those years the farmers had the lowest share of the gross national product, the lowest share of the consumer dollar, the lowest share of the food dollar, the lowest return on gross farm sales, the lowest return on total capital investment, the lowest return on capital investment performed, and the lowest level of parity of income.

Mr. President, I say that there is no question of Dr. Butz' honesty, integrity, or ability. I would suggest that this is a choice of the President. Unless we find Dr. Butz dishonest or lacking in integrity, we have some obligation to confirm the appointment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, although I think we find ourselves in a strange position on the floor of the U.S. Senate this evening, I do think that if there is any difference in the common goals and the common hopes for American agriculture and for the country for finding a solution to a problem that has been with us for many years, and with respect to which both parties and the Presidents of both parties have tried and not succeeded, to find any permanent solution to the agriculture problem.

Mr. President, I think we recognize the fact there is not an identifiable solution to the farm problems in America today. What we are calling a problem is one of the greatest God-given abundances mankind has ever known—the abundance of productivity so great we have not been able to devise, even with the best scientific knowledge we have available, a means of increasing this productivity and improving the conditions of living in rural America, in which there has been a tremendous improvement in the last 40 years, where we have brought America out of the mud and where we have seen so many programs to put more acreage into production.

I am not sure I am factual on this, but I believe my State has a higher percentage of land under production than any other State in the Union. I refer to agricultural production. My State has constantly been faced with the problem of agricultural abundance since the 1930's. It is something we have not been able to find a permanent solution to. But we have found that there are certain programs and ways and means that allow a decent transition.

For approximately 15 years not many voices were raised at the farm migration, and farm migration has been going for 40 years now. This is not a recent development, but in recent years farm migration has gotten to the point where we are beginning to see the beginning of the end of the farmer in America as we have recognized him in the past. There are two sides to this question. Is it good or bad, and what is happening in America?

I want to make one statement in the

December 1, 1971

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 20009

beginning just to clarify some of the things that have been mentioned to me. Different members of the press have inquired of the junior Senator from Iowa if the Democrats simply want a political issue and if that is the reason we are opposing the nomination of Earl Butz.

First, I should say that as Democrats we are not opposing the nomination of Earl Butz. I certainly am not. I served three terms as chief executive of my State. I have the most healthy respect for the right of the Chief Executive to appoint members of his Cabinet, barring some glaring deficiency that would make them ineligible, either because their integrity was questioning—which I am not questioning at all in the case of Mr. Butz—or because they identify with a philosophy that may be so drastic in one direction it could bring about the beginning of the end of an American we have known and loved. Even that is debatable. I do not want an issue; I want a solution for the farmers of Iowa and America. The Secretary of Agriculture is going to be named by the President of the United States, who is President Nixon, regardless of whether it is Mr. Butz or someone else, should we defeat this nomination.

I am saddened that I rise in opposition to this nomination. I would much prefer to find myself willing and able to support it.

I think the chairman of the National Republican Committee would concede that I am not a candidate for anything, and that we share a common concern for our agriculture States.

Mr. DOLE. The Vice Presidency is open to the Senator's party.

Mr. HUGHES. To reassure the Republican National Chairman, I am not seeking that either.

I do want to point out that as I am sure the Senator from Kansas knows the question of the National Farmers Organization, which has headquarters in my State of Iowa, was raised in the committee hearings by the Senator from Kansas himself. On page 104 of the hearings, a copy of which is on the desk of each Senator here tonight, are the questions of the Senator from Kansas to Mr. Staley, president of the National Farmers Organization and his responses, which speak for themselves. The hearings reflect that he has not accepted a position on the policy committee of the National Democratic Party; that he would serve on that committee if he could serve on the Republican policy committees, as well, and what I believe are his sincere attempts to stay neutral in the political role of national politics.

As in the case of all people who accept their responsibility in America locally, I suppose he is registered and that he has a preference politically. In that, I am sure all members who are active in any political organization respect the activities of members of the opposite party for their very activities which preserve our American freedom.

My only statement at this time is to point out that I, for one, am not looking for an issue in the nomination of Mr. Butz. I am hopeful that when the vote is counted that Mr. Butz will not be confirmed. I would rather he had not been

recommended. In light of the fact he is before us today and we have the requirements of consent, and that no one questions in this body today, I find myself in a reluctant role as the former chief executive of my State, in opposition, for reasons I intend to go into in detail later on.

But I think the record should be made clear that we wish and hope that a solution can be forthcoming and quickly and that there can be relief in programs brought to the American people by the Secretary of Agriculture in this administration, and not in 1973, because by 1973 thousands and thousands of people all over the country are going to be leaving the farms. They are in great difficulty today and tonight.

The banks in the small rural communities of my State are wondering about the renewal of loans; the merchants are wondering when cash registers are not ringing. The situation is not confined to farmers. They are bidding on farm machinery, automobiles, and buildings; everything is affected.

As anyone here from an agriculture State knows, one of the real things that happens when we have great overproduction, as in our region in corn now, is the overbuying of feeder cattle to consume the corn. Thousands will be brought in at high prices to gather the corn that is left, which is sold at 90 cents in the hope that it will bring \$1.19 or \$1.20 in beef prices next fall. The cycling effect could be worse next fall in the beef and pork industry than it is today.

So I am not interested in a political issue. I am interested in a solution for the farmers of America, and they need help because they are in deep difficulty and trouble.

For the time being I am going to yield the floor because the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture wishes to make a statement. I will complete my statement at some later time during the course of debate on this nomination.

Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia for whatever time he desires.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the nomination of Dr. Earl L. Butz as Secretary of Agriculture.

I do not oppose Dr. Butz because of any question about either his integrity or his ability.

I oppose Dr. Butz because I do not believe that he can possibly provide the Nation's farmers with the kind of support that they must have in the position of Secretary of Agriculture.

Since I have been a Member of the Senate I have always felt that the President of the United States should have the widest possible discretion in filling vacancies in his Cabinet. We should give the President maximum latitude in picking men to carry out his policies.

Normally, I would go along with the President's choice for Secretary of Agriculture.

However, these are not normal times for the American farmer. During 1970 the farm parity ratio, which measures the relationship between the prices received and the prices paid by farmers, averaged 72 percent. This year the farm

parity ratio has dropped even lower. It has been as low as 68 percent. Currently farmers are receiving 69 percent parity, 69 percent of a fair price. Not since the depths of the great depression has farm parity been so low.

Unfortunately, the American farmer no longer has the political clout that he has enjoyed in years past. When I came to the Senate in 1957 the so-called farm bloc was the most powerful in Congress. Today it is one of the weakest. That fact was dramatically illustrated during the debate on the Agricultural Act of 1970. Congress was forced to accept the kind of farm bill that the administration wanted or get no farm bill at all. The administration was able to exert this kind of power because it was impossible to get a farm bill through the House of Representatives without the administration's support.

The farmers' voice in the Congress has grown steadily weaker because the farmers' numbers have decreased dramatically in the past few decades. In 1960 there were over 15 million people living on the Nation's farms. The 1970 census shows a decrease of one-third; the farm population has dropped to less than 10 million people. For the first time, the 1970 census showed that less than 5 percent of the Nation's people were actually living on farms.

These facts point up the urgent need for a strong Secretary of Agriculture, but more importantly, a Secretary of Agriculture who will fight for the Nation's family farmer.

American agriculture survived Ezra Taft Benson's 8 years as the Secretary of Agriculture because American agriculture had sufficient strength in Congress. Now that this strength is diminished, I doubt that our family farmers could survive additional years under a Secretary of Agriculture who reflects the Benson philosophy.

Of course, I realize that the mere fact that Dr. Butz served as Assistant Secretary under Secretary of Agriculture Benson does not mean that he was the major architect of the bankrupt Benson farm policies. What concerns me more is the fact that Dr. Butz was one of the most vocal spokesmen for the Benson policies both during his service as Assistant Secretary and in the decade which followed.

Dr. Butz has been a popular speaker among some business groups and he has made a number of statements on farm policy since he left the position of Assistant Secretary. These statements reflect little sympathy for the plight of America's family farmer. Rather, they indicate Dr. Butz' feeling that the constant stream of rural outmigration is not a bad thing at all.

I am pleased that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has maintained its bipartisan tradition in its consideration of the nomination of Dr. Butz. The vote in the committee was characteristic of this bipartisan tradition, for one-third of the Republicans on the committee opposed Dr. Butz while two-thirds of them supported him. One-half of the Democrats on the committee opposed the nomination and one-half of them supported it. I believe that the 8- to

6-vote in favor of reporting the nomination reflects deep concern about Dr. Butz's philosophy among committee members.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and forestry, conducted comprehensive hearings on the Butz nomination. Dr. Butz was grilled extensively by myself and other members of the Committee on Agriculture. In addition, we heard from 10 public witnesses and placed additional statements in the record. All witnesses who requested to testify and were present were heard by the committee.

I must say that Dr. Butz responded well during cross-examination by the committee. I was basically pleased with the response that he gave to questions I asked about the cotton, tobacco and peanut programs. In addition, I was encouraged by his statement in support of rural development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a copy of some of my colloquy with Dr. Butz.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

With the permission of the committee, then, we will proceed to question Dr. Butz.

As previously announced, we will ask questions for 10 minutes and at that time I will ask to yield the floor to the next Senator and we will make the rounds; and we can start all over again if anyone wants to begin from that.

Dr. Butz, as you know, there has been considerable speculation and some antagonism in the farm circles about your appointment, primarily because you were Assistant Secretary of Agriculture during the administration of Secretary Benson. He is not very popular in some farm quarters, as you may know.

I would like to ask you a few questions to ascertain your farm philosophy. Quite a number of telegrams came in this morning which are of concern here, and I will ask that they be made a part of the record in due course. Here are some more primarily based on what you think about farm commodity laws and price supports and acreage controls and things of that nature.

I take it from your testimony, in chief, that you believe farm income is much too low in most instances?

Mr. BUTZ. Indeed I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you support price supports for the basic farm commodities?

Senator CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, can we have them quiet outside?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, by all means. Instruct the officer to maintain order, and if order is not maintained ask him to please clear the hallway.

You favor farm price supports for basic farm commodities?

Mr. BUTZ. Yes, in some way. I favor the Agricultural Act of 1970 which, I think, reflects the composite attitude of the Congress. I think this is a good approach because it permits farm prices to be at the export level so that we can really export a maximum amount of farm products and yet get the income to our farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you want the support price at a reasonably low level—that is, the loan price—where the commodity can flow freely into the channels of commerce and whatever support over and above the loans can be made up in payments; is that your philosophy?

Mr. BUTZ. That essentially is the philosophy back of the Agricultural Act of 1970, and I would buy that. I hope we can continue to expand our export markets.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you favor production controls to try to keep supply reasonably in line with demand?

Mr. BUTZ. I think the program for set aside acres is a form of production control. The Department has announced for the 1972 program the goal of 38 million acres diverted under the feed grain programs; I subscribe to this. I like the idea of letting farmers have maximum freedom of choice within the acres they plant on what they plant.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think 69 or 70 percent of parity is much too low for support prices for farm commodities?

Mr. BUTZ. I think that that level is much too low for farm income. Let's distinguish, now, between prices and income.

I want adequate income and I want good prices, but let's don't interfere with movement of commodities into export. We export roughly 1 acre out of 4 in this country and I want to keep those exports high.

The CHAIRMAN. Someone informed me that when you were Assistant Secretary or at some prior date that you were opposed to one-price cotton. Is that your attitude today or was it ever your attitude?

Mr. BUTZ. To one-price cotton?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, that you favored the two-price cotton system in this country.

Mr. BUTZ. No; I don't think that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. You favor one-price cotton, the same price domestically as the export price?

Mr. BUTZ. Oh, I misunderstood you. No, indeed. The export price has to be below the domestic price plus Division payment.

The CHAIRMAN. But you wouldn't favor the American textile industry having to pay 15, 20 cents a pound more for American produced cotton than some mill in Shanghai, would you?

Mr. BUTZ. Mr. Chairman, that is a problem that has to be worked out and I just feel I am not close enough to comment. I don't want to drive the textile industry out of the United States; I realize competition from Japan and Formosa is tough, where they buy American cotton at cheap prices and then put the textiles back here at subsidized prices; and that is the kind of competition that I am convinced we must not allow our textile industry to face.

The CHAIRMAN. Let's pursue that further.

Let's assume you had two-priced cotton. A bale of cotton in Georgia would cost the mill about \$40 more a bale than the mill in Shanghai or Japan. You wouldn't favor a return to that policy? We got away from that when our farm legislation provided for one-price cotton several years ago, you know, and I think it is very popular with the producers and it is popular with the industry. Insofar as I know, it is popular with everyone in our country. No one has made any effort to change it. You wouldn't want to change that policy?

Mr. BUTZ. I have to state in all candor I live in a state where we don't grow cotton and I am not too familiar with the cotton problem; but let me say the answer to your question is "No."

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I was informed at one time you said the tobacco program was bad. I don't know whether you ever made that statement or not, but do you support our tobacco program as it is operating at the present time?

Mr. BUTZ. Yes, sir; I do. Mrs. Butz comes from North Carolina which is an important tobacco State, I get there frequently, and for a Hoosier I have some concept of the tobacco industry. As a matter of fact, two of her brothers are tobacco farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. You do raise some tobacco in southern Indiana?

Mr. BUTZ. We have five counties that raise some burley; you are right, but the answer to your question is yes, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. You favor the continuation of our present peanut program?

Mr. BUTZ. To the extent I am familiar with it, I do; and, again, I am out of the peanut territory but I will simply have to say to the extent I am familiar with it, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. As you know, poultry and eggs have been selling below the cost of production for the better part of 2 years; and I am informed that the egg producers in America now have a minus net worth. In other words, if they liquidated they couldn't pay off the debts. Many of our broiler producers are rapidly going broke. Do you have any idea as to what ought to be done in that regard to try to bring income in those commodities up?

Mr. BUTZ. Mr. Chairman, you are right; poultry and eggs are a disaster area and they have been for a couple of years. They have been that way too long. I understand the egg producers are getting together now with a recommendation that will shortly come to the Congress to permit them to have a slaughter program of hens to bring the hen population under some degree of control. The egg situation has been aggravated some by the development of a vaccine for Marek's disease that came on the market a year ago; the net result is when you vaccinate chicks for Marek's disease, you have less mortality; the hens can live longer and healthier and the rate of lay has gone up.

Ultimately, we will adjust to that in the size of our poultry flocks, but it has had the effect momentarily of prolonging this glut on the market. When you combine that with the occasional story that appears in the national magazines about cholesterol in eggs and that type of thing it has an adverse impact.

To the extent that I am familiar with what the united egg producers are attempting to do now, I think it is a step in the right direction and I will support it. We simply must reduce the size of our laying flock.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me see if I understand your reply.

You would favor some program to regulate supply in line with demand that was agreeable to the egg producers of the country?

Mr. BUTZ. Yes, sir; I would. As I understand it, they want to administer this themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. That is my understanding. They have talked with me about it; they are in the process of drafting some legislation—

Mr. BUTZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). Trying to get substantial agreement, as I understand it, among the industry now.

Mr. BUTZ. Yes, sir; I think it is a wonderful thing when the industry undertakes to correct its situation itself with authorization by the Congress but run the program themselves; I will support that fully.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Now, suppose—and they have not reached that point yet—but suppose the broiler industry came up with a similar plan that was voluntary and agreeable on their part, would you support that?

Mr. BUTZ. I certainly would. The broiler industry is different, however, because of the short-term nature of it. You are only about three to three and a half months from setting the egg to processing the broiler. With your laying flock you are locked in for a year.

The CHAIRMAN. Right.

Now, another thing, there has been some criticism—you made reference to it yourself in your testimony, to the fact that you served on the boards of several large corporations that deal in the agribusiness area. There has been some speculation that your devotion to duties and sympathies may be more in line with agribusiness and large farmers than small farmers.

Would you respond to that again?

Mr. BUTZ. Yes; I would be glad to, Mr. Chairman.

As I said, the agribusiness complex is a part of the total agricultural movement in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you yield at that point? I have been notified that my 10 minutes have expired.

[Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Since you are in the midst of your response, I ask unanimous consent that you may answer the question.

[Laughter.]

Mr. BUTZ. Do you have consent?

The CHAIRMAN. No one objected; I do have consent.

Mr. BUTZ. As I said a moment ago, I regard agri-business as a very essential part of the food and fiber chain in America. The bushel of wheat in Kansas really has value until it is translated into a loaf of bread or a breakfast roll in Philadelphia. The hog on an Indiana farm has value when it becomes a porkchop or a loin roast in St. Louis. Therefore, to say that you are for one or against the other. I think, is unfair to anybody working in agriculture; you are for all of it. This is part of the total process of getting our food and fiber from the farm to the ultimate consumer and, by the same token, agriculture now uses many purchased production inputs that we used to produce on the farm.

When I was a youngster we used to produce our own power in the form of a colt every year or two. We produced our own hay and oats. We didn't have commercial fertilizers; we didn't use insecticides; we didn't use herbicides; we didn't use antibiotics; we didn't use mechanical power. We shucked the corn by hand. Those things have been transferred off the farm now but they are no less a part of agriculture now than they were when we did them on the farm and, therefore, I think those of us in agriculture have got to be concerned with the total chain of the food and fiber complex in this country which includes the purchase of production inputs; we want them produced efficiently. We want them scientifically; we want them economically. This includes processing, distribution and merchandizing. These things must be done effectively or farm income suffers.

So my position, Mr. Chairman, is that the goal for us in the Department of Agriculture and the goal for us in the colleges, too, as we work with farmers, is to do everything possible to enhance the income and the living satisfaction of our people on farms. We cannot do that effectively if we ignore the people who supply them with their production inputs or who purchase their produce and process and merchandise it.

In some cases those are cooperatives that do that; in some cases they are private corporations. We must work with whomever is working in this field.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Secretary, you made reference this morning to rural development. It is something that our committee is very much interested in. We just this year established a new Subcommittee on Rural Development. We have been very active in that field this year. The original title IX of the farm bill of last year that Senator Dole and I cosponsored, and we wrote into the bill a commitment on the part of the Congress to achieve a sound urban-rural balance. There was a further portion of the bill that required reports from the executive branch of Government on the quality of life and so on in rural areas; and third, a directive for the Government to locate new Federal installations in less populous rural areas. I personally think that most of the major domestic problems in this country are directly attributable to the fact that we have over 70 percent of our people living on less than 2 percent of our land.

Rural America has exported its best talent, its college educated, high school edu-

cated, because the jobs were not available there and it has also exported the people with the fewest skills and the lowest education and it is the latter group that contributed to the problem of welfare and crime and housing and pollution that is commonly referred to as the urban crisis.

Since that time the President himself has been talking about rural development and has submitted a bill along that line. It is before the committee now, also with a subcommittee bill that has been reported after extensive hearings.

I wish you would state your views to the committee as to what you favor in the area of rural development, what you recommend that we do to try to create job opportunities in rural America, and what we can do to stem the massive migration from rural America to urban America and hopefully reverse it.

Mr. BUTZ. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of a very vigorous rural development program. I think this involves the whole infrastructure of rural America.

As well as the agricultural programs, it involves highways; it involves sanitation facilities; it involves water supply; it involves drainage; it involves recreation; it involves education; and it involves economic opportunity. I think you are absolutely right in urging as strongly as you can urge the installation of Federal facilities in parts of rural America; keep the job opportunities out there. And I couldn't agree with you more that the part of what we call urban blight is the result of the migration of people without skills and with low-educational levels and low aptitudes to these heavily concentrated population areas.

I feel this not only must be stopped—I would like to see it reversed.

The CHAIRMAN. The President's Commission that he appointed on this particular problem recommended a massive infusion of capital, private, and public, to achieve industrial development to create jobs in rural America. Would you favor that approach?

Mr. BUTZ. I certainly would by whatever means you can use; it may be tax incentives; it may be short-time subsidies of one kind or another. I think any legitimate approach that did reverse this trend of population migration must be pursued vigorously.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you familiar with what has been going on in England and the Scandinavian countries and Israel in that regard?

Mr. BUTZ. Just in general.

The CHAIRMAN. They have made much better strides than we have. We have talked about it for sometime, for a good many years, as a matter of fact, but we have done little about it.

I may say the Senate by a rather decisive vote voted additional tax credits to achieve that result just yesterday.

Mr. BUTZ. This was wise.

The CHAIRMAN. And I think there is tremendous interest in the Senate in that field and hopefully, the House; and I hope we can achieve a positive breakthrough in that regard in this Congress.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I view Dr. Butz' statements on the cotton, tobacco and peanut programs as commitments to carry out these programs as they have been carried out in the past. If Dr. Butz is confirmed by the Senate, I intend to hold him to these commitments. I intend to hold him to his statement in support of rural development. Dr. Butz' statements at the committee hearing were largely satisfactory. However, I have always been skeptical of "deathbed" conversions. I question whether any man can repudiate overnight a philosophy that he has held for a lifetime.

In 1952, before Ezra Taft Benson took

office as Secretary of Agriculture, realized net farm income totaled \$14.1 billion. In 1960, the last year of Mr. Benson's secretaryship, farm income totaled \$11.7 billion.

During that same period the farm parity ratio moved downward from 95 to 81 percent.

In addition, farm surpluses skyrocketed during the Benson era. Commodity Credit Corporation inventories of farm commodities increased from \$2.2 billion to \$5.6 billion.

Mr. President, many American farmers are already on the verge of bankruptcy. As a Senator from Georgia and as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I cannot risk a repeat of Benson-type farm policies. Therefore, I am compelled to vote, as I voted in the committee, against the nomination of Dr. Earl L. Butz as Secretary of Agriculture.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa for yielding to me, and I yield the floor.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for his statement and his fairness in making it. The decision he has reached I believe is one that we share.

I want to at this time indicate that in the nomination of Dr. Butz for Secretary of Agriculture we have the unusual instance that the nominee is not only an unfortunate choice for the position but is a choice that may well be prejudicial to the interests of a large segment of the American people and to the future of rural America.

It should be made clear at the outset, as I have stated previously, that I do not question the ability and the integrity of Mr. Butz. That is not an issue with me personally. In fact, I think he has been very successful in the programs and policies that he has outlined and believed in for American agriculture. And that is one of the major problems that I have.

The future of the independent American farmer is plainly at issue in this nomination.

We are rapidly reaching a continental divide in the development of American agriculture. Mr. Butz' philosophical commitment, as reflected in his entire career as a university dean, agribusinessman and Government official, has been devoted to a direction that I believe is inimical to the future of rural America and the country as a whole.

Here are the basic points:

The farm economy of the United States, as it relates to the independent commercial farm operation, is in critical condition.

There are not many people who question that.

As a result, tens of thousands of farm families each year are being driven from the land to our already congested cities. It should be made plain that we are not talking about marginal, inefficient farms, but well-managed, small, and middle-sized units that have produced efficiently through the years. The economic determinism which holds that this is inevitable and perhaps good for the farm economy is a viewpoint to which people are entitled.

S 20012

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

December 1, 1971

But many of us are deeply convinced that it does not have to be that way and that if the accelerating consolidation of our productive farmland into large corporate farms and agribusiness combines continues, both are society and our economy will suffer irreparable damage in the long run.

I was again asked today, Mr. President, if there is anything in my State any longer that may properly be called a family farm. I have not recently checked the statistics, but when I was first elected to the Senate and came into this body, the average acreage of an Iowa farm was 269 acres. That is by no means a large, corporate structure. It is much larger than would have been considered the ordinary small family farm operation 25 or 35 years ago. But at the same time, it is still a relatively small farm operation.

Opposed to the acreage, however, the age of the average farmer was 59 years. Young people could no longer afford to start farming for the returns on the investment, even with that acreage.

The average capitalization, as reported in a scale which I lately put in the record of the hearings, on an Iowa farm is \$93,000.

The questions that are raised here I think are serious questions. We seem to be accepting the philosophy in America that there is no alternative to driving people off the farms of America, unless they want to go into huge farm operations.

We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in research on productivity, in moving toward the direction of largeness. This may be right or it may be wrong, but how much have we spent in the effort to make a productive unit out of a rather small productive area in our country? The small farm is worth preservation, Mr. President; and dedication in that direction is needed.

Now, if ever, there is a desperate need for a dynamic leader in the Department of Agriculture with the interests of the independent farmer at heart. It is high time that the vast resources of that Department should be employed to provide services to the independent farmer in his hour of need, rather than contributing, to the extent it has, to the industrialization of rural America.

The nomination of Mr. Earl Butz for Secretary of Agriculture has met with strenuous opposition from farmers, environmentalists, and many others concerned with the future of rural America. Many segments of American agriculture are caught in the most serious farm depression in decades. The scene of farmers stacking up their unsellable corn in the streets is painfully reminiscent of that earlier farm depression.

Seventy thousand farms a year—most of which are efficient and sizable operations—are being driven out of business. For the most part, these are not farmers who want to leave; these are farmers who are being forced to leave agriculture at a time of serious unemployment and already overcrowded cities.

The exodus from farm to city is not inevitable. It can be stopped if we vigorously address ourselves to the task. But

Mr. Butz has clearly indicated that he believes the trend is unavoidable, with nothing Government can do to stop it or slow it.

Because of Mr. Butz devotion to agribusiness, his philosophical ties to agribusiness, his scorn for the food stamp program that he would be charged with administering as Secretary, and his apparent lack of concern for the serious threats to our environment, he is not the man for the job that needs to be done.

I might point out, Mr. President, that sadly enough, as concerns his position as Secretary of Agriculture, I cannot recall in my lifetime a popular Secretary of Agriculture, in either political party. The job is a job that most men in America would not want and would not take. If they were asked to, they would be reluctant to accept it, because they know the seriousness of the problems we face in agriculture in America. They know the criticism leveled at the Secretary himself, which is ongoing and continuing, regardless of the party in power.

At this particular time, Mr. President, we have reached a point of no return.

Mr. President, there are several items I would like to submit as part of the Record.

First, the Atlanta Constitution last week ran an excellent editorial applauding the committee vote on Mr. Butz of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE) chairman of the Agriculture Committee. I think that the vote of the committee chairman, along with the opposition of the ranking minority member of the Agriculture Committee, is very significant in these deliberations. It shows the broadbased and nonpartisan opposition to this nomination.

Second, Mr. Butz has already disclosed his relationship to three agribusiness corporations: Ralston-Purina, Stokeley-Van Camp, and International Minerals and Chemical Corp. The senior Senator from Oklahoma has submitted into the Record of November 19, 1971, a report on these three companies that outlines their activities and interests.

These directorships have not been the only formal ties that Mr. Butz has had to agribusiness. He also has served on the board of directors of the Food Foundation, the Foundation for American Agriculture, and the Nutrition Foundation. Each of these foundations are primarily supported by and serve the interests of agribusiness through research and education programs. I am submitting some information about each of these foundations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From The Atlanta Constitution, Nov. 24, 1971]

#### TALMADGE VERSUS BUTZ

Georgia Sen. Herman Talmadge surprised a lot of people this week by voting against confirmation of President Nixon's choice for secretary of agriculture, Earl L. Butz.

The Talmadge vote was extremely significant. As chairman now of the Senate Agriculture Committee, Talmadge swings a good

deal of influence in anything affecting federal policies on farmers or anything related to agriculture. He chose not to fight the Butz appointment actively, and the Senate committee narrowly (8-6) recommended approval.

But the Talmadge vote may have great significance when the full Senate considers the appointment. His vote, as chairman and ranking Democrat on the committee, will have considerable weight. Moreover, Sen. Jack Miller of Iowa, the Republican ranking member on that same committee, also voted against the Butz appointment.

Talmadge has, as a rule, declined to oppose any President's choices for cabinet level posts on the basis that any President basically has the right to name the members of his official family. So, it was a move in this case not taken lightly. Butz has not, on the basis of his record, been a good spokesman for agriculture, commented Talmadge after the committee vote.

Butz is an able man, as Talmadge and others acknowledge. But, as Talmadge put it, "Our small farmers are being plowed up fast enough anyway without accelerating that process." Butz's ties are primarily to major agribusiness companies, rather than to farmers. He resigned director posts with three large agribusiness corporations after being nominated for secretary of agriculture. And, his previous agriculture department experience was as one carrying out the policies of former Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, a man who wanted to eliminate all the price supports which most farmers find critically important. "That was an unhappy day for American farmers," said Talmadge drily, referring to the Benson era.

We believe that Sen. Talmadge voted in the best interests of Georgia and American farmers when he voted against the appointment of Earl L. Butz as secretary of agriculture. We would hope that the U.S. Senate will, in the end, vote down the nomination.

#### INFORMATION ON FOUNDATIONS

According to Who's Who, Mr. Butz has also served as a member of the Board of Directors of the Farm Foundation, located in Chicago, Illinois. Working with the land-grant colleges and the USDA, the Farm Foundation recommends and conducts extensive research into agricultural and rural problems. In addition to earnings from its endowment fund, the Farm Foundation in 1971 received contributions from the following agribusiness companies: Agway Foundation; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway; John Deere Foundation; Firestone; First National Bank of Chicago; B. F. Goodrich Fund; Goodyear; International Harvester; International Mineral & Chemical Corp.; Northern Trust Co.; Sears-Roebuck Foundation; Standard Oil (Indiana) Foundation; Swift Co. Foundation; and WGN Continental Broadcasting Co. Its Board of Directors includes representatives of most of those companies, as well as representatives of various land-grant colleges.

Mr. Butz has also served as a director of the Foundation for American Agriculture. The foundation, located in Washington and incorporated in 1945, describes its "primary purpose" as being "to inform the individual and public with reference . . . to American agribusiness; conduct appropriate scientific research; cooperate with institutions of learning . . . by making available . . . reports and publications on agribusiness subjects; publish articles . . . by persons prominent in agribusiness . . . and avail itself of all recognized media for the dissemination of its educational programs. A further primary purpose of the Foundation has been and is to increase understanding throughout rural and urban America of the role agribusiness plays in our total economy. To accomplish these objectives, it has worked diligently during



December 1, 1971

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

S 20015

the past twenty-four years. (From 1969 Foundation publication, Ellipses theirs.)

Its Board of Directors includes representatives from: Sunkist; Central National Bank; Armour; Quaker Oats; Ralston-Purina; Agway; E. I. Dupont; Safeway Stores; B. F. Goodrich; Bank of America; Sears, Roebuck; Chas. Pfizer; Commercial Solvents Corp.; and International Minerals & Chemicals Corp.

Mr. Butz has also served on the Board of Directors of the Nutrition Foundation. The purposes of the Nutrition Foundation are set forth in its 1969-1970 Annual Report:

The food supply in the United States is among the finest of any country in the world. The amount produced is adequate for everyone to achieve good nutrition, and the food is of the highest quality. At every step, producers, processors, distributors and government agencies take great care to maintain this quality for the consumer. Notwithstanding the high quality of the food supply, poor eating patterns and a lack of understanding of the basic principle of nutrition are prevalent among all socio-economic levels of the population.

The Foundation's program and activities over the years have been focused on maintaining this high quality of food by adding to the knowledge of nutrition through research and through education of the public. Included on the Board of Directors are representatives of Sunkist, General Foods, Green Giant, Armour, Del Monte, Kraftco, Quaker Oats, E. J. Heinz, General Mills, Pillsbury, Swift and Kellogg, as well as representatives of leading universities and foundations.

The enumeration of these associations and foundations is not in any way to challenge their validity or importance. There is nothing inherently wrong with agri-business or with the entities they establish to promote their best interests. Mr. Butz's record of service to this segment of the agricultural economy is extensive and—I am sure—distinguished. But where is his record of accomplishment and contribution to the other segments of American agriculture: the small independent farmers and their families? the farm workers? I have not been able to find it. My staff has not been able to find it. Nothing Mr. Butz said at his confirmation hearings helps to illuminate it. The only conclusion that I can make is that Mr. Butz has spent his long and unquestionably distinguished career dedicated to the interests of big farming and big farm business. This is not the kind of balanced, people-oriented background that I believe a Secretary of Agriculture must have in 1971.

Mr. HUGHES. Some of these operations I have mentioned unquestionably benefit small farmers and farmworkers to some extent. We are all benefitted, for example, when nutritional standards increase. But much of the research sponsored by agribusiness through these foundations has to do with increasing the farmer's productive capacity. That avenue has been a largely unrewarding one for our Nation's small and medium-sized independent farmers. For as our Nation's agricultural capacity has dramatically increased over the past 2 decades, small and medium-sized independent farm operators have just as dramatically been forced to leave farming. In the process, farm production has become concentrated in fewer and fewer hands.

Little of the work that Mr. Butz has done through these agribusiness associations and foundations has attempted to solve the most real and pressing problem of small and independent farmers—survival itself.

Certainly the small farmer is interested in a new fertilizer that will increase

his yield; but he is more interested in knowing why his past jumps in productivity have not been translated for him into higher farm income, why every effort he has made to improve the quality and the productive capacity that he has, has achieved nothing more, in net balance, out of the efforts he has made.

Third, I am submitting for the RECORD the statements of opposition to Mr. Butz from: the National Farmers Organization, the National Farmers Union, Environmental Action, and the Sierra Club. Senator HARRIS is submitting statements of opposition from other national organizations.

I ask unanimous consent that the statements be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF OREN LEE STALEY, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FARMERS ORGANIZATION, SENATE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE, NOVEMBER 18, 1971

I appreciate this opportunity to appear in opposition to the nomination of Earl L. Butz as Secretary of Agriculture.

We are shocked and angered at the selection of a man so closely tied to the corporate giants moving into agriculture. It is a disastrous appointment from the producer's standpoint.

Business men wouldn't accept appointment of a national labor leader as Secretary of Commerce; laboring men and women wouldn't accept appointment of the president of General Motors as Secretary of Labor; and farmers shouldn't be called on to accept appointment of Earl Butz as Secretary of Agriculture.

We oppose Dr. Butz because he is a leading spokesman for those who accept the proposition that it is not necessarily bad to continue eliminating hundreds of thousands of farmers each year and permitting integrators and others to gain more control of the food industry.

We oppose Dr. Butz because he accepts bigness in agriculture and the movement of people off the land as inevitable.

We oppose Dr. Butz because he has identified completely with agribusiness and preached its gospel while serving in the Department of Agriculture in the 1950s, as an administrator at Purdue University, as a widely traveled speaker, and as a board member for three agribusiness giants.

We are opposed to giving a man with these views and associations a national platform and the tremendous power and influence that go with being Secretary of Agriculture.

There is no point in mincing words on what this confirmation vote means. It means making a choice on the kind of "agriculture" and the kind of rural America we want to encourage in the years ahead.

In meeting its constitutional responsibility, the U.S. Senate will choose between a historic commitment to opportunity for people on the land and a goal of mechanical efficiency that drives people out of rural areas, eliminates farm and small business enterprises, and destroys rural communities.

In a 1959 speech quoted in Farmer's Digest, Dr. Butz said "the fact that an individual producer may surrender some of his managerial freedom and may transfer part of his risk-taking to someone else is really a very small price to pay for the advantages that flow out of an integrated system." By this statement and by his testimony before this committee yesterday, Dr. Butz makes clear his concern for the whole chain of food production, handling and marketing. Surely he is an honest man.

Gentleman, we do not believe the big companies like Tenneco, Dow Chemical, Bank of America, Ralston-Purina, Boeing, and Stokely-Van Camp need the sympathetic assistance of a Secretary of Agriculture in order to survive. Certainly our farm families do need understanding and support.

Some of these big companies, like Tenneco for example, readily concede that these intrusions into farming are part of a bold move to dominate the food industry from field to checkout counter by controlling all phases of production, processing and marketing.

Dr. Butz, by serving on the board of two companies directly involved in these activities, is clearly tied to these attempts to destroy the family farm system and usher in a concentrated, corporate agriculture.

The confirmation situation is further complicated by a conflict of interest in which Dr. Butz took in \$26,800 a year as a board member of three agribusiness companies while serving as a dean at Purdue. This committee should determine what services Dr. Butz performed for these companies to make him worth that much money.

It also should find out how well he could serve the farmers of his state as dean of agriculture at the same time he was drawing \$12,000 a year as a director of an aggressive integrator like Ralston Purina.

Dr. Butz has disclosed the amount of stock he owns in three agribusiness firms he served as director—International Minerals and Chemicals, Stokely-Van Camp and Ralston-Purina—and disclosed that this represented about one-third of the value of his investment portfolio. What about the other two-thirds? Is it made up of agribusiness companies or others that would be affected by decisions of the Secretary of Agriculture?

This appointment would put him in charge of programs and regulatory agencies that deal with at least three of his own companies, possibly more, a conflict of interest situation that could not be humanly avoided by merely placing his stocks in a blind trust.

On Tuesday the General Accounting Office issued a report stating that poultry inspection had not eliminated unacceptable conditions in most of 68 plants reviewed. It found that unacceptable conditions continued in 17 plants criticized in a previous GAO review. The plants are not named, but will Dr. Butz, the ex-director of the biggest single factor in the nation's broiler industry, vigorously straighten out this situation and end the shortcomings in that industry?

The record will show that in poultry inspection hearings in the 1950s he advocated gradualism. Certainly after 15 years unacceptable conditions should not be tolerated, but will they be?

The committee should determine whether or not the companies in which Dr. Butz has been a director have contributed to improved conditions in the areas in which they operate, or whether they have provided leadership in bringing better conditions. I would like to submit to the committee a copy of a recent Nader report, containing a chapter entitled "Poultry Peonage," with which you might start such research.

Dr. Butz can resign his positions with the agribusiness companies he has served but it is unlikely he will be able to resign his long-time agribusiness biases.

Gentlemen, when you put your stock in trust you still own it. You still have your interest in the companies. How can you expect Dr. Butz to protect free and open bargaining between producers and the companies with which he has been associated?

Taking Ralston-Purina's far-flung business interests as an example, possibilities of conflict immediately arise in the supervision of the Commodity and Exchange Authority, the food inspection services, the Packers and

Stockyards Administration, and the Agricultural Research Service.

There are a number of other important questions that we feel the committee should explore fully with Dr. Butz during these hearings.

Does Dr. Butz favor expansion of cattle feeding by packing companies, for example, or does he favor legislation that would, in effect, limit feeding to those engaged in agricultural production on a fulltime basis?

Does he favor continuation of tobacco allotments now held by family farmers or would he discontinue this program and turn production over to the big tobacco companies?

Does he favor continued agricultural research centering on high volume, huge concentrations of animals and capital and so-called efficiency or does he favor research that considers social efficiency, people and social costs?

Does he favor integration of the hog industry with eventual destruction of the market and a takeover by big agribusiness firms or does he favor doing what is necessary to keep this industry in the hands of independent producers?

Does he favor international commodity agreements with guaranteed price floors or does he favor an export policy that results in sales abroad at any price?

Does he favor an increase of up to 25% in feed grains price supports or does he favor continuation of the present disastrously low levels being paid to producers?

These are some questions Dr. Butz should be asked before these confirmation hearings come to a close.

There has been a real reaction among farmers to this appointment because few men who have served in the Department of Agriculture have made more inflammatory statements than Dr. Butz. His widely-published statement advising farmers to "adapt or die, resist and perish" is typical.

He is widely known among family farmers for his callous lack of concern about their welfare and the reaction you are seeing and feeling today truly comes from the grass roots.

We urged the President to withdraw the appointment the afternoon it was announced. We now respectfully urge you to reject formal confirmation of Dr. Butz, and all that he represents in terms of agriculture and rural America, and to advise the President to name someone who is committed to strengthening rural areas and preserving individual enterprise in agriculture.

#### DECHANT OPPOSES SENATE APPROVAL OF EARL BUTZ AS SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Farmers Union opposed the appointment of Dr. Earl L. Butz as Secretary of Agriculture here today at a hearing of the Senate Agriculture Committee.

The National President of the Farmers Union Tony Dechant told the Committee that Butz' appointment raises serious questions about the future of family farm agriculture in America. He said the National Board of Directors of the Farmers Union voted unanimously to oppose the nomination.

Dechant said, "Dr. Butz' economic views are archaic. He has been in the active service of a number of corporations which seek to dominate the rural economy.

"His appointment as Secretary of Agriculture would suggest:

"1. Farmers can expect a continuation of low farm prices which have been administered by the Nixon Administration.

"2. Farmers can expect little relief from the Nixon Administration's disastrous set-aside land retirement plan which has proven unworkable as a system of supply management.

"3. Farmers can expect a continuation of President Nixon's policies which favor corporations at the expense of producers.

"4. Farmers can expect the farm program to be a pawn in President Nixon's bid for reelection, with possible attempts to sugarcoat the bitter pill of the set-aside program, and with final phaseout of workable farm programs scheduled to follow the November 1972 election.

"The steep decline of farm parity began during the era of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, for whom Dr. Butz served as Assistant Secretary. The departure of millions of families from rural America swelled into the greatest mass migration in history. No Administration has been able to reverse the trend which was set in those years. Dr. Butz favored a phase-out of positive supply management long before the term 'set-aside' was coined by the Nixon Administration. He was an exponent of the massive soil bank land retirement plan during the Benson years.

"Dr. Butz' service to Purdue University while he was on the payroll of several large corporations represented a conflict of interests. Since he is philosophically and politically dedicated to the advocacy of their cause, we believe a similar conflict of interests would continue in the President's Cabinet, even though he resigns from his positions of corporate responsibility."

Dechant stated that

"Dr. Butz has a bad record, but we recognize that a man can change. Our concern is heightened because of the gravity of the present situation for farmers. We cannot afford to provide time for the new Secretary to develop some new approach. The Nixon Administration took nearly two years to shape and refine the present set-aside fiasco. It was not really new—it was the old massive land retirement scheme advocated by Dr. Butz a decade ago. Mr. Chairman, we do not have two years, or two months for more political gimmickry at the expense of the American farmer.

"We know what must be done. We must have effective supply management. We must have improved prices. We must have a massive infusion of low interest rate credit to rescue agriculture from the disaster created by our present farm program.

"I believe it is time that the Congress looks seriously at the proposal to create strategic reserves of our basic farm commodities. We must greatly increase our capacity for farm storage. We must raise commodity loans in order to protect farm income when prices are at their lowest. We must scrap the ill fated set-aside plan. Legislative proposals to accomplish all of these goals are before you.

"Farmers like other businesses must be afforded opportunity to make longer range plans. The optional diversion in the 1972 feed grains program, for example, does not fit farmers need to make such plans. It's time that this administration recognize the need for effective, permanent supply management programs. Piecemeal and stop-gap measures to cope with emergency situations which could have been avoided are not good enough. Farmers deserve better.

"A little over a year ago I called for the resignation of Secretary of Agriculture Hardin. I did so to dramatize the extent of the alarm with which farmers regarded the unworkable set-aside land retirement scheme and the undue pressures of the Administration on the Congress and Senate to adopt it. The former Chairman of this Committee, Senator Ellender said that never in 34 years had he felt such pressures from the Executive Branch. As you know, he refused—as did Senator Herman Talmadge the present Chairman of this Committee—to sign the House-Senate Conference Report which was adopted under Administration pressure."

Dechant said that he is opposing Dr. Butz' appointment in order to dramatize again our deep concern over the future of American agriculture if present trends continue. He said that "if decisive changes are not made

in our farm program before spring planting time he would be back again, calling a press conference and asking for the resignation of another Secretary of Agriculture."

#### ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION,

Washington, D.C., November 25, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR: Like the nation's farmers, the nation's environmentalists have a major interest in the selection of the best possible man for Secretary of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture makes important decisions concerning nationwide pesticide use; it has the potential to save or destroy many of the country's streams and marshlands; it can encourage or discourage the growth of giant agricultural conglomerates. And, of course, the Department includes the U.S. Forest Service with its vast responsibilities for the careful utilization of the nation's forests.

Because of these responsibilities, Environmental Action feels that any prospective Secretary of Agriculture must be willing and able to seriously assess environmental factors whenever they come up in the decision making process.

Although our organization did not testify at the Senate hearings on the appointment of Dr. Earl Butz, information which came out of those hearings has convinced us that Dr. Butz will not adequately consider environmental questions should he become Secretary of Agriculture. We are thus strongly opposing his confirmation.

Dr. Butz has been quoted as saying: "We've got to decide shortly whether we're going to have a little thermal pollution in our waters or have brownouts in our cities at 3:00 in the afternoon when you turn the air conditioner on. You take one or the other."

Such statements assume the inevitability of environmental destruction and shown an unflinching, unenlightened attitude that can only harm the vast majority of Americans.

Environmental Action urges you to vote against the confirmation of Earl Butz as Secretary of Agriculture.

Sincerely,

PETER HARNIK  
(For the staff).

#### NEW QUESTIONS ABOUT DR. BUTZ AS NOMINEE FOR SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

The Sierra Club raised new issues concerning the appointment of Earl C. Butz as Secretary of Agriculture. In a letter to Sen. Herman Talmadge (D-Ga.), the Sierra Club requested that he re-open hearings on the confirmation of Butz so that his attitude and intentions regarding issues of concern to conservationists could be examined.

The hearings held last week barely touched upon important issues relating to how the nominee proposes to deal with: pollution from agricultural use of pesticides and fertilizers and from increased siltation; the controversial altering of our waterways through stream channelization; and the critical issue of the management of our National Forest System.

Citing statements made by Butz, the club pointed out that he has been openly antagonistic towards environmental concerns and towards the entire environmental movement. Dr. Butz refers to what he calls "the real threat to American agriculture... the threat that comes from the environmentalists, or from the do-gooders or from consumerism or from whatever you want to call it."

The following are some more quotes from a speech made by Dr. Butz before a National Agricultural Advertising and Marketing Association Farm-marketing seminar in Minneapolis on April 26, 1971:

"We need to extol the benefits that come from these chemicals and pesticides and antibiotics that we use."

"... then I see these environmentalists on the other side trying to hold us back and

trying to impede—not trying, but the net effect is to impede—the progress we're making in scientific agriculture."

"This fadism that we follow as a nation and currently it's ecology and pollution and it hits us in agriculture right in the solar plexus. But, we are now completely dependent on a scientific agriculture, upon the use of these things which are dangerous."

"We've got to decide shortly whether we're going to have a little thermal pollution in our waters or have brown-outs in our cities at 3:00 in the afternoon when you turn the air conditioner on. You take one or the other."

"These people think that God made nice red, plump, juicy, healthy apples. They think that nature makes apples that way. As a matter of fact, God put the worm in the apple—man took him out. God put the parasite in the pig—man took him out. God put the termite in the timber—man took him out."

Such statements cause deep concern with conservationists about the nomination of Dr. Butz for Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, as I see it, there are three basic issues against Mr. Butz.

First. His firm and long-time belief that the loss of another 1 million farmers in the next decade is inevitable and not bad. It is not inevitable. The USDA has tremendous resources at its disposal to reverse that trend: Its great procurement power; the half billion dollars of research money it administers each year which today goes largely to finance research of immediate benefit to agribusiness; the subsidization policies that have encouraged bigness; and the taxation policies that have encouraged corporatization. Where are these 1 million families—and the hundreds of thousands of rural business families that they will take with them—where will they go? Onto our already overcrowded welfare rolls? Into our swelling unemployment figures? Perhaps. Into the already overcrowded cities? Perhaps. We can reverse the trend. In my opinion, we must reverse the trend.

Second. His ties to agribusiness which erect what I believe is a philosophical conflict of interest. His record of service to this one narrow segment of agriculture is clear; his record of service to independent farmers, whose interests are not always consistent with those of agribusiness, is not so clear.

Third. His apparent scorn for the food programs he would be charged with administering as Secretary and his opposition to the legitimate objectives of the environmental and consumer movements. Just 7 months ago, he called the food stamp program—if I read the record correctly—"just short of ridiculous." If he is singing a different tune this week, it is a very recent conversion.

Mr. President, I consider this vote one of the most serious ones we will take during this session. American agriculture and rural America are at a crossroads; I am afraid Mr. Butz will take us down the wrong path.

I will vote no on the confirmation of Mr. Butz.

As I stated in the beginning, it is my hope that the next Secretary of Agriculture will seek to reverse the trends that have been so apparent, particularly in the last decade, that have been continu-

ing at alarming pace, in which there is Congress, I might add, or by the administration—in trying to reverse these trends. It is an unfortunate choice at a time when we needed someone who was the leader, who could point in the direction of hope for the farmers of this great Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Iowa for his excellent statement in opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Dr. Butz, and I certainly associate myself with all he said.

I want to make two or three points tonight, and I expect to speak again on this nomination before the final vote.

First, the people who met in Philadelphia and wrote the Constitution of the United States labored a good deal and argued a good deal over responsibility for the appointment of members of the Cabinet. They came to the conclusion that, while the President of the United States ought to be able to choose some of his employees, irrespective of the will of the Senate or of Congress, he should not be able to appoint certain of those who would serve with him except by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The founders of the Constitution decided that those who would serve in the Cabinet of a President would not be appointed solely by the President, but that they ought to be nominated only by the President and confirmed by the Senate and that, therefore, the appointment of these officials should be joint.

I believe that that was a wise decision. I believe that since the writers of our Constitution so decided, Members of the Senate have a special responsibility to exercise their independent judgment upon these kinds of nominations.

One such nomination is the one now before the Senate, the nomination of Dr. Earl L. Butz to be Secretary of Agriculture. I believe that since the President cannot appoint that kind of official by himself, and since that appointment power is shared with the Senate, Senators have not only an opportunity but also a responsibility to exercise their independent judgment about this appointment and similar appointments; and I do exercise my independent judgment about that.

I do not think my judgment is trammelled by or restricted or limited by any more restrictions or limits or trammels than those which affect the President's nomination powers. I think I have just as much latitude in deciding whether to advise and consent to the nomination as the President had in making the nomination. I believe that is the clear and constitutional mandate.

Mr. President, I am very impressed by the most important Member of the Senate in regard to this nomination and what he has had to say—that is, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the distinguished Senator from Georgia. He listened to all the debate and discussion. I do not think it can be said that he is an unduly partisan Member of this body. All of us are

partisan to some degree, but I do not believe it can be said that the distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE) is an unduly partisan Member of this body. He is the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, and he opposes this nomination for the reasons he has very clearly set forth. I find them very persuasive.

I also am much impressed by the fact that the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), also has voted against this nomination in the committee. I do not believe he did that for any partisan reason, because he is of the same party as the President of the United States and of the same party as the nominee. Like Senator TALMADGE, he probably is the Member of the Senate we ought to pay most attention to in regard to this nomination. He opposed the nomination in committee, and I find that terribly persuasive.

Mr. President, I have an uncle who lives in Kansas. He is an auctioneer. He is a man whose livelihood depends a great deal upon farm prosperity. I have a great deal of identification with that State. It is a State just north of mine, the State of Oklahoma. I have spent considerable time in that State, in towns like Oakley and Garden City and others, in the wheat harvest which I followed for a good many years when I was a young man. I was impressed by what I read in the newspapers that the distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) had to say about this nomination and the way he viewed it in light of his responsibility to the farmers of Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I do not think that what Senator Pearson said was said in a partisan vein, because the Senator from Kansas is of the same party as the President of the United States, and he is of the same party as Dr. Butz. The Senator from Kansas said he thought that the President of the United States ought to withdraw this nomination. I believe he is right. I may say, as a Senator from a State neighboring his, representing farmers of the same interests as his, that I believe he was quite right in asking that this nomination be withdrawn. If it is not withdrawn, Mr. President, I am persuaded that it ought not be confirmed by the Senate.

May I say, also, that I am very much impressed by what the distinguished Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) has said. He led off the opposition here today in speaking against the nomination of Dr. Butz. I have spent a great deal of time in the State of North Dakota, in the wheat harvest, in towns like Ray, N. Dak., and Bowman, N. Dak., with the distinguished Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG), as I have with the distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK). The interests of those farmers are very much like my own.

Therefore, I find it very persuasive that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) a member of

the Agriculture Committee, which had an opportunity to examine this nominee and his views, spoke out in opposition here today to this nomination. I do not think that Senator Young spoke in any partisan way. He is of the same party as President Nixon. He is of the same party as the nominee. Yet he states that the nomination is not in the best interest of the farmers he represents in North Dakota. I believe that it is not in the best interest of the farmers of Oklahoma, either. I do not think it is in the best interests of all Americans, whether they are farmers or whether they live in the cities.

I served as a member of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, which looked into the tragic urban riots which we saw in so many cities in the summer of 1967. One of the things we said in the report of that Commission was that we never were going to be able to solve the problem of the cities unless we could stem the tide of out-migration from the rural areas in States like Kansas, Oklahoma, North Dakota, and Iowa, into the big cities.

I believe that it is a terrible thing to say it is inevitable that there will be more and more small farmers forced off the farms, as Dr. Butz has said. I do not think this is a partisan matter. I think we have had the wrong agricultural policy for a long time, but we are now at a pivotal time in the history of the country, and in the history of American agriculture, where we are moving into more and more bigness, more and more corporatization of farming.

We can do something to try to stem that flow of small farmers from their home States into the big cities where their problems are often, if not always, much greater.

I support the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) to hold down subsidies to a limit of \$20,000 each. We are not talking so much about efficiency here, because if it is efficiency we are after, why do we have to pay so much in subsidies to the large and rich farmers, to the big corporate farmers? They are efficient because we spend so much money with them. I think we would be well advised to stop doing that.

I support the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) to provide for collective bargaining on behalf of American farmers. I believe they have got to have more economic power in the marketplace. I believe that that is a basic concept, if we are to protect the independent farmer as against the corporate farmer, the rich farmer, the hobby farmer, who are gobbling up most of the farms in the country.

I have introduced legislation in the Senate which would seek to enforce the law in regard to irrigation water. The law now is that if a farmer takes advantage of irrigation water, built with the taxpayers' money, it should not be in excess of 160 acres. I believe that that law should be enforced.

That is what will happen if the legislation which I have introduced is adopted.

I am very much pleased by the Federal court decree lately to come out of a Federal court in San Diego, Calif., which seeks to uphold legislation in that State in regard to residency and irrigation water, holding, as I understand the case did, that a corporation was not entitled to take advantage of the residency laws and get publicly built water, or water from publicly built irrigation systems. I believe that that is a very important case. I want further to make secure that holding by the court with the legislation I have introduced.

I support the legislation introduced by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) which would take away from the corporations the special benefits which they have if they go into farming in regard to organized labor and big agribusiness corporations, like Tenneco, or Standard Oil of New Jersey, who are now going into farming. If they do go into farming, they do not have the same unemployment compensation or workmen's compensation or organization laws that apply to them in the rest of their business. That works out to be an incentive for big corporations to go into farming, because their workers cannot organize in that enterprise and that gives them a special incentive to come in and take over farms in opposition to independent farmers.

I believe that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) is on the right track, that the big farmers should have to obey the labor laws that apply to them in other enterprises. I believe that if we will pass that legislation, we will take away the special subsidy and incentive that goes to the big corporation farmers and makes them more competitive with the independent individual farmer.

Lastly, I support the legislation introduced by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), called the Family Farm Act, which would prevent the kind of tax loss farming, and the vertically integrated conglomerate farming, which has given a special incentive for corporations to come in and take over farming from the independent and small farmers.

The facts are, Mr. President, that we do not have to be big, we do not have to be a big corporation or in agribusiness in order to be efficient. That is some kind of elite, often liberal notion in the East. That is not so, Mr. President. We have been told that by people like Mr. Butz and others. The reason why we see so much bigness in agriculture and so much corporatization in agriculture is because the Federal Government subsidizes them to get into it, through irrigation water, land-grant colleges, and other laws. We should stop that.

The Federal farm support laws are on the side of the big and not the small farmer. My dad has been telling me about that for a long time. He is quite right. So I stand with the distinguished Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Young) another member of the Committee on Agriculture

and Forestry, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) who is from an agricultural State like mine, not because they are Republicans, but because I think this is not a partisan matter.

I stand with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry not because he is a Democrat but because I think he is well informed on this issue.

I hope, Mr. President, that we will defeat this nomination. I believe that the way to dramatize the issues involved here, that bigness is not best, that we should stop the rich people, the hobby farmer, like lawyers, doctors, and big corporations, like Tenneco, like Ralston-Farina, Standard Oil, and others, from taking over agriculture and driving more people off the farms into the cities.

The way to dramatize the issue is to defeat this nomination.

Some have said, "Well, maybe the Democrats would like to have Mr. Butz confirmed as Secretary of Agriculture and then they will have an issue during the next year." But I believe with Mr. Staley and others in the National Farm Organization, and other farmers who have talked to me about this matter, that there are many farmers who cannot stand another year. There are many farmers that do not have a year, and if we get more and more men like Mr. Butz in control of agriculture, they will not have another year.

So, Mr. President, I hope that we will not confirm this nomination.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce my support of Secretary-designate Earl L. Butz to be Secretary of Agriculture.

On the basis of the study I have made of Mr. Butz' record and my desire to permit the President to have members of his own Cabinet in whom he has confidence, I intend to vote favorably for the confirmation of Mr. Butz.

I had some concern about the nomination of Mr. Butz and put three basic questions to him in a letter which Mr. Butz has answered both in person and confirmed by letter to my satisfaction.

My own farm advisory committee in Illinois has also strongly supported the nomination of Mr. Butz.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Percy-Butz correspondence as well as a copy of a letter from the chairman of the Percy farm advisory committee and a letter from another member of the committee addressing itself to the question of Mr. Butz' association with agribusiness be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 30, 1971.

DR. EARL BUTZ,  
Secretary-designate, U.S. Department of  
Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. BUTZ: Since your nomination for the position of Secretary of Agriculture, I have received many communications from Illinois farmers. A number of them have expressed support for you and there have been expressions of disapproval as well, as I am sure you are aware.

My responsibility to Illinois farmers is to have a man confirmed as Secretary of Agriculture who will have as his objective, among others, the raising of farm income, preserving

December 1, 1971

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 20017

and improving the quality of life in rural America, and protecting the concept of the family farm which is the backbone of Illinois agriculture.

It would help me if I had a statement from you that I could make available to Illinois farmers on your approach to these three, basic questions, satisfactory answers to which are essential to my support of your nomination.

I am pleased to note that a substantial majority of my own Illinois Farm Advisory Committee support your nomination, but as I have already mentioned, there have been a number of communications in opposition to you and your answers to the above questions would be very helpful to me in considering your nomination.

I wish also to express appreciation to you for your effective support of our strong recommendation to the President that the Taft-Hartley Act be invoked against the dock strike that was so adversely affecting Illinois farmers.

Sincerely,

CHARLES H. PERCY,  
U.S. Senator.

DECEMBER 1, 1971.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,  
U.S. Senator.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I appreciate the opportunity of providing you information which may be helpful in resolving questions regarding my position on basic issues such as improving farm income, bettering the quality of life in rural America, and preserving family farms.

Having been reared on a family farm, I am earnestly interested in preserving these farms. Their preservation is absolutely essential to our economy and I shall do all within my power as Secretary to keep as many family farms in operation as possible. In my testimony before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I quoted from a report of USDA's Economic Research Service which stated there may be a decline of approximately 1,000,000 in the number of farms by 1980. In quoting these figures, I was in no way approving of these projections nor advocating that this occur. On the contrary, it is my very firm belief that the Secretary of Agriculture, whoever he may be, should recognize such trends and bring all the resources of his Department to bear in the form of corrective action.

You will recall that during my testimony I stated my belief that corn and feed grain prices, which are so important to the farmers of Illinois, are too low. Because so many facets of agriculture are tied to feed grain prices, it is imperative that the Secretary take immediate steps to improve these prices. Some of these alternatives were discussed before the Committee. When confirmed, I shall take all steps authorized by law to bring these prices up and if other steps are required which are not authorized by existing statutes, I shall ask for that authority from Congress. As an economist, I know the importance of the continuing to expand exports of farm produce and livestock products so that the family farmer as well as others will benefit economically from expanded overseas markets. I plan to actively apply myself toward reaching the goal of \$10 billion in agricultural exports. America's farmers are entitled to a fair return for their labor and their investment and I want to be their spokesman in this cause.

Rural development is one of the great challenges facing this Administration and I conscientiously believe the programs of the Department of Agriculture can contribute more significantly toward improving the quality of rural life. By providing rural communities with the basic facilities needed to sustain their people, such as housing, water, and sewer systems, telephones and electric power, we can also attract industries. This will provide jobs and take the pressure off

our crowded cities where so many rural residents have been forced to move for lack of opportunity in the country-side because mechanization of agriculture has reduced available jobs.

I am dedicated to working in every way that I can and by every conceivable means of administrative, legislative, and personal persuasion to achieve these goals. Your assistance will be most appreciated as we work toward these ideas which are so vital to our Nation.

Sincerely,

EARL L. BUTZ.

ROBINSON, ILL.,  
November 22, 1971.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,  
U.S. Senate,  
New Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: Confirming my telegram, please be advised that in my opinion Dean Earl Butz is an excellent choice for Secretary of Agriculture. I have polled a number of my farmer friends and they agree. I am sure his appointment would not enjoy the universal approval of all farmers in the country, but I am just as sure that far and away the majority of all farmers in this area would welcome his appointment.

I am aware that some of his critics claim that Dean Butz is oriented too much in the direction of "Agri-Business." For this to be a valid criticism it would be necessary to presume that Agri-business is the enemy of the farmer. Nothing could be further from the truth. Although there may be exceptions, generally speaking Agri-business is probably the best friend the farmer has. Only when they join hands and work together can either Agri-business or the farmer realize their full potential for contributing to the economy and the general public good.

Although some of his critics claim they would like to see a "Practicing Farmer," whatever that is, as Secretary of Agriculture, I submit that to find one whose other qualifications would remotely match those of Dean Butz would be a difficult task indeed. Therefore, I urge your favorable consideration of his appointment.

Respectfully yours,

IVAN R. MILLER.

NOVEMBER 22, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR:

In reply to your telegram received yesterday regarding the appointment of Dr. Butz, I feel he is well qualified for the post and the only possible reason for not confirming the appointment would be his image as a corporation director. This seems to concern Sen. Harris but I don't think it will hurt anything in Illinois.

I'm sorry to see Clifford Hardin leaving the post. He has started a farm program that has brought more flexibility for the farmer than any of the programs of the past. The corn situation was not his fault. We all passed up a fine bean market to try to make a killing in corn and this is what happened. After the big crop was in the ground we still had a short time in which we could have locked in \$1.50 but let that slide also.

There is no one whom the President could suggest that would be above Democrat criticism.

Looking forward to our next meeting on Dec. 13.

Sincerely,

HARLAN RIGNEY,  
Chairman, Percy Farm Advisory Committee.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I rise in support of Dr. Earl L. Butz and intend to vote for the confirmation of his appointment as Secretary of Agriculture. During the past week hearings were held and from them arose a controversy con-

cerning the qualifications of Dr. Butz as Secretary of Agriculture. For the first time in several years the national press indicated an interest in agriculture and people from all walks of life had a glimmer of the importance of our Nation's farmers and ranchers and their relationship to this Nation's economy. Now the time has come to vote for confirmation of Dr. Butz, and I must say the decision I made has been one of concern to me. I have visited personally with Dr. Butz and have analyzed both what I have heard and read. I have had telephone calls from the State and numerous letters and telegrams. I ponder the endorsement of some groups and likewise the opposition of others.

Dr. Butz' closing statement to the Senate Agriculture Committee is one I feel indicates his attitude and philosophy:

Now, one closing comment, I have spent my life being a vigorous, articulate, advocate for agriculture; for a progressive agriculture. I have tried to make farmers proud of their profession, for I think agriculture is a proud profession. Food is the first law of life and that those who produce it are top on the priority list in a country like this.

The family farm must be preserved but I do not want to lock it in concrete. I want it to be able to grow, too, and to adjust. If the family farm I grew up on had not adjusted, we would be shucking corn by hand and we would be knocking potato bugs off potatoes with a wooden paddle. The family farm has to adjust; it has to produce more in the days ahead to survive. So I am strongly in favor of the family farm, with flexibility to adjust and to provide an adequate living for the farm family.

We hear about corporate farms in America. Less than one percent of our farms are corporate farms, and they are mostly family corporation farms. I strongly support a prosperous and developing rural America. I think the thrust of this committee to support a rural development program is a proper thrust. We must develop employment opportunities in rural America so we do not continue to jam our population up in the New Yorks and Philadelphias and Chicagos and Baltimores...

A strange coalition has evolved to oppose the confirmation of Dr. Butz. I wonder where the Ralph Nader Public Interest Research Group, National Welfare Rights Organization, Friends of the Earth, National Sharecropper Fund, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Americans for Democratic Action, Washington Research Group Action Council, the AFL-CIO, and United Auto Workers were when the Congress was struggling to formulate a new farm program? Where were they when the farm State Senators were fighting to maintain the present limitation of payments ceiling; where have they been year after year when this Nation's farmers were so in need of support to establish and maintain a livable income? I wonder if their interest at this late date is not one of self-concern? Perhaps Dr. Earl Butz is the man who can bring farming and ranching back to a way of life that can be enjoyed by our farm families. Perhaps Dr. Butz will find a solution to sagging farm prices and assist in establishing a better rural life.

I think Dr. Butz realizes that the time has come for agriculture to have an effective voice here in Washington. I think



he will be an outstanding spokesman for agriculture, placing the blame for low prices squarely where it lies . . . perhaps on a dock strike which prevents shipment of exports, perhaps on a strike against producers at a time when crops must be harvested or rot in the fields. Dr. Butz has assured me that he will continue to represent the farmer in the administration; that he will continue to be a vigorous, articulate advocate for agriculture; that he will be a salesman for American agriculture. I agree with Dr. Butz when he says that urban America needs to realize that the farmer is a professional in his endeavor just as the doctor or lawyer. This needs to be done by "selling" the concept of modern-day agriculture.

We have reached a time in our agricultural history when we must face the facts. As long as politicians in Congress continue to place politics over the economics of trying to solve the farmer's problems, we will face a declining rural America. The farm policies of the United States evolve from the Congress; the Secretary implements the programs. I believe Dr. Earl L. Butz can and will implement the policies of this Congress in the best interest of our Nation's farmers and ranchers. He should be afforded the opportunity to accomplish what he advocates should be done to further enhance living in rural America and stabilize our Nation's agricultural economy. As always, my primary obligation is to the farmers and ranchers of Texas and the Nation, and I trust that Dr. Butz will represent agriculture to its fullest extent.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I have just learned that an official of the Department of Agriculture, at the time Earl L. Butz was an Assistant Secretary, today charged that Mr. Butz, after deliberately stopping a price-fixing investigation of Safeway Stores, Inc., omitted mention of it though questioned by a committee of the Congress.

Mr. President, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch today carries a story by Lawrence Taylor that quotes Lee Sinclair, who was chief counsel for the Packers and Stockyards Administration when Assistant Secretary Butz quashed an investigation Mr. Sinclair recommended of Safeway price-fixing activities.

The charges made by Mr. Sinclair as quoted in Mr. Taylor's article are very serious. If they are true, Mr. Butz should not be confirmed as Secretary of Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Taylor's article be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks, but I wish now to call to Senators' attention some portions of the circumstances to which I have previously alluded that have now been amplified by Mr. Sinclair.

Last Wednesday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carried the entire record of Mr. Butz' testimony in the hearings on the meatpacking industry held by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly in May 1957.

Under questioning, Mr. Butz initially denied that there had been a preliminary investigation of Safeway's feedlot operations, then he agreed there had been

an investigation. Mr. Sinclair later testified that a preliminary investigation had been completed, that there appeared to have been violations of the Packers and Stockyards Act, and that he recommended further inquiry by his branch under that act.

According to Mr. Sinclair, however, the real issue is that Mr. Butz successfully concealed from the subcommittee the fact that he had suppressed a price-fixing inquiry under the law and transformed it instead into a broad economic study including the feedlot matter. Mr. Butz described his broad economic study in some detail, but failed to refer to the central issue.

Mr. Sinclair explained today that he was unaware of Butz' omission at the time of his own testimony and as he was not questioned, did not himself mention it. But he said today:

The effect of transferring this matter to agricultural research for an economic study was to completely stop the investigation of alleged violations of the (Federal) Packers and Stockyards Act by Safeway. It was well recognized by us in the department that this was the effect and also the purpose of this economic study. That was our belief and, of course, it turned out that way.

Mr. President, I hope that all Senators will read Mr. Taylor's story carefully. I hope that they will agree with me that Mr. Butz' admission on the public record that he failed to administer the Packers and Stockyards Act, his promise that he "would do the same thing again" and the allegations, if true, which were made today, of his failure to be candid with a congressional committee, clearly disqualify him for public office.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Dec. 1, 1971]

EARL L. BUTZ

Earl L. Butz while an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in 1957 omitted key details from his testimony before a Senate subcommittee about the nature of a departmental investigation of Safeway Stores, Inc., a former official of the department said today.

The former official, Lee D. Sinclair, charged also that Butz, nominated by President Richard M. Nixon as Secretary of Agriculture, deliberately halted the Safeway investigation in 1956, even though a preliminary inquiry showed that price-fixing had occurred in the Company's meat buying operations on the West Coast.

The Senate began debate of Butz' nomination today with a vote expected before the end of the week.

At the time of the Safeway investigation, Sinclair was head of the Department of Agriculture's Packers and Stockyards Branch which conducted the inquiry until it was stopped.

Sinclair, who had discussed the investigation earlier with the Post-Dispatch but had asked not to be identified, agreed to speak for the record in making his accusations of Butz today.

He said that Butz, questioned by the Senate Judiciary Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee at a hearing in May 1957, did not disclose that the Department's investigation into Safeway's operations had uncovered evidence of price-fixing. Instead, Butz confined his discussion to the allegations raised by the subcommittee members that Safeway had used its livestock feedlot operations to

depress West Coast beef prices, a subject that Sinclair said was a minor part of the overall investigation.

Butz told the subcommittee that Safeway had sold most of its feedlots and apparently had violated no federal laws.

He said that the feedlots were part of the case involving Safeway. He was not asked about the rest of the case and did not volunteer additional information.

Although the subcommittee apparently was unaware of the alleged price-fixing, it questioned Butz sharply about why the Safeway investigation was dropped.

Butz replied that the matter involved issues that went beyond Safeway's operations and that it has been turned over to an economist for study.

He said that if the study turned up evidence of federal law violations, it could have been referred back for further investigation.

Sinclair said today, however, that the study "did not deal directly with Safeway. It dealt with the flow of meat products on the West Coast." He said that no action ever was taken against Safeway for its alleged price-fixing.

"The effect of transferring this matter to agricultural research for an economic study was to completely stop the investigation of alleged violations of the (Federal) Packers and Stockyards Act by Safeway," Sinclair said.

"It was well recognized by us in the department that this was the effect and also the purpose of this economic study," he said. "That was our belief and, of course, it turned out that way."

In the hearing, Butz testified that six general areas were included in the economic study. They included such items as "analysis of the whole meat distribution in the San Francisco Bay area," and "Los Angeles chain store beef procurement and wholesale pricing study."

Sinclair, who also testified during the hearing, said that his remarks contradicted some made earlier by Butz.

At one point during the hearings, Butz was asked whether a preliminary investigation had been made into Safeway's feedlot operations.

"Not to my knowledge," he replied. Then, apparently corrected by someone else at the witness table, he added, "Was there? Yes, there were some."

Sinclair testified a moment later that a preliminary investigation had been completed and that his recommendation for a full-scale inquiry had been overruled by Butz and two other lower departmental officials.

Butz then said, "Mr. Chairman, may I point out at this point that this was discussed in my office—and we decided there to broaden the scope of this investigation."

"And I would accept full responsibility for that and would do the same thing again."

Like Butz, Sinclair did not mention in his testimony the price-fixing investigation he had directed.

Sinclair said today that he had not attended the earlier hearings and was unaware of what had been said about the inquiry.

"The subcommittee did not ask me any questions about the nature of the case," he said. "I did not know how much they had gone into it in the earlier session. I did not know that Butz had not mentioned the price-fixing."

Sinclair said that after he testified, his once friendly relationship with Butz grew cold. "Butz never contacted me in any way after that," he said. "Shortly thereafter, I was promoted to a job that carried very little responsibility."

Sinclair left the Agriculture Department in 1960 and went into private law practice in Washington. Among his clients today is the National Farmers Organization, which has opposed Butz's nomination as secretary.

December 1, 1971

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 20017

Sinclair said, however, that he was not serving as a spokesman for the group.

He recalled that as the Safeway investigation was being killed, another official with the department said to him, "Lee, you're not going to get a chance to complete that investigation."

Butz was the Agriculture Department's number three man from 1954 until 1957 when he resigned to accept a position at Purdue University.

Since his nomination to the top departmental post, he has been criticized as a friend of big business whose agricultural interests harmed the small family farmer. Butz has denied these claims and said that he was a realist who foresaw the trend toward larger and more efficient farms.

During Butz's time as Assistant Secretary to Ezra Taft Benson complaints were raised that Safeway and other big firms had close ties with the department. At least three Safeway executives served as administrative assistants to Benson. One of these, Lorenzo Hoopes, worked for Benson only one year before rejoining Safeway in 1954.

There was no indictment, however, that a Safeway man was on Benson's staff at the time of the price-fixing investigation.

BUTZ NOMINATION COULD MEAN DISASTER FOR FARM ECONOMY

**Mr. PROXMIRE.** Mr. President, tomorrow a vote will be taken in the Senate that could have a profound impact on our farm economy and hence the national economy in the months and years ahead. The question at issue is whether or not we should confirm Dr. Earl Butz as Secretary of Agriculture.

It has become increasingly fashionable as the number of farmers dwindles to downgrade the importance of agriculture to the economic health of the Nation. After all, fewer farmers means fewer farm voters, and fewer farm voters means that we can ignore the needs of these voters with less peril to our chances for reelection.

However, we are only fooling ourselves if we think that we can allow our farm economy to seriously deteriorate without affecting national strength. Although a small percentage of our population is cultivating the land, a very substantial number of people are employed in supplying the needs of farmers, from fertilizers to farm machinery. Additional millions of people are involved in processing and distributing the produce of our farms—from the factory worker to the truck driver to the retail store manager or owner.

As a Nation, we are able to devote a very substantial amount of our gross national product to capital goods production and the amenities of life because the average family only spends 16 percent of its income on food.

Most rural communities are entirely dependent on the economic health of the farmer—especially the small family farmer. While agribusiness may find financing available at giant banking institutions in our major cities, the small rural banker rises or falls on the business he does, or does not do, with neighboring farmers. Smalltown hardware stores, dry goods stores, newspapers, and other business enterprises are in the same boat.

There may be some who feel that rural areas in the last analysis should be the preserve of giant farms, with corporate

backing, which use the latest machinery, pesticides and antibiotics and minimize the role of the average rural American and his family. I categorically disagree with this view. I think it is damaging to our free enterprise system, to our proven ability to produce food cheaply, and to good conservation practices.

Now let us take a look at how Dean Butz feels about the farm economy, particularly with regard to the family farmer—the backbone of American individualism.

First, Dean Butz seems to subscribe to the doctrine of the survival of the fittest. He has been quoted in an interview with the Washington Post as saying:

Adapt or die. That's a harsh law but it always has worked. If we hadn't used that law we'd still be riding in buggies and plowing with horses.

However, very strangely, it seems, he has never spoken out against the tax inequities that place a premium on corporate farming and make it very difficult for the small family farmer to compete. He has never called for a reworking of capital gains provisions that encourage large corporate entities to buy up vast quantities of land, farm it for 10 years or so—ruining the land in the process—and then sell the exhausted land, which is good for very little at that point.

Apparently the fittest, by the Butz definition, are those with the money and the lawyers to find loopholes in our tax laws, those who exploit rather than replenish the land, and then move on.

Another subject Dean Butz has avoided discussing is the use of water made available through Federal reclamation projects by giant landholders in violation of the 160 acre limitation. This limitation, written into law at the turn of the century, requires large landholdings to be broken up before the landowners can receive the benefit of water paid for with Federal tax dollars. The law has never been enforced.

"Adapt or die"—or be big enough to be able to make your own special privileges.

In the same interview with the Post, Dean Butz predicted that the 2.9 million farms of today will be reduced to 1.9 million farms by 1980. This disciple of Ezra Taft Benson apparently is perfectly resigned to overseeing the death of one million farms in 10 years. Can anyone doubt that these farms will be small family farms?

What will be the consequence of this continued reduction in family farms? More migration to the cities. A further depletion of the rural economy. Greater welfare costs as men and women who have farmed all their lives are forced onto the relief rolls. A sharp reduction in good conservation practices as the husbandman is replaced by the impersonal corporate giant.

This is the way the tide is running now. It is a trend that should seriously concern us. Can we sit idly by and let events take their course? Or should we try to revitalize our rural economy and preserve the small, economical family farm unit? Dean Butz clearly would

let the tide run out until all but a handful of farmers are stranded off the farm.

Dean Butz' pronouncements on the environmental movement are part and parcel of his disregard for the needs and the advantages of the small family farming unit. Big farming has brought with it the increasing use of pesticides, such as DDT, growth hormones, such as DES, and practices that can seriously deplete the soil. These so-called economies of scale can have a serious long-term impact on the environment despite seeming short-term advantages. Thus it is not surprising to see Dr. Butz—whose adapt-or-die statement apparently means grow huge or die—go after the environmentalists hammer and tong.

Here are some quotations taken from an April 26, 1971 speech:

I am going to talk this morning about something that I think is a real threat to American agriculture and it involves our future and something you can help us with. And that's the threat that comes from the environmentalists, or from the do-gooders or from consumerism or from whatever you want to call it.

Then I see these environmentalists on the other side trying to hold us back and trying to impede—not trying, but the net effect is to impede—the progress we're making in scientific agriculture.

This fadism that we follow as a Nation and currently it's ecology and pollution and it hits us in agriculture right in the solar plexus. But we are now completely dependent on a scientific agriculture, upon the use of those things that are dangerous.

Mr. President, I would be the last Member of the Senate to stand on this floor and say that the environmentalists are always right and that scientific farmers are always wrong. But I also think it is extremely foolish to say that scientific farmers are always right and environmentalists are always wrong. As a matter of fact there are times when the two approaches are complementary—such as in the use of biological pest control methods as a substitute for deadly environmental poisons.

Any man who looks on the environmental movement as a mortal enemy to the farm economy is very ill suited to harmonize the interests of both groups—interests that must be accommodated if we are to have an abundant yet safe food supply at the least possible environmental cost. Any man that says, as Dr. Butz has said, that if we move to organic farming we are going to have a decide which 50 million Americans are going to starve, is temperamentally unsuited to the job of integrating new environmental techniques into our farm economy.

How about DDT? What does Dr. Butz say about this? Those of us whose States border on Lake Michigan are particularly concerned because Coho salmon that have been introduced into the lake are being adversely affected by DDT runoff. The reproductive cycle is destroyed in many instances. Here is what Dr. Butz thinks about that problem:

We hear a lot about the run-off of DDT in Lake Michigan over here. We don't hear much about the benefits of DDT. You don't hear much about malaria having been wiped from

the face of the earth. You don't hear much about human health having been improved. You hear about DDT having been found in the fish taken out of Lake Michigan over here running off the Wisconsin hillsides and the like of that to which I argue that, something like this: That Lake Michigan has DDT in it. The Cohoe salmon thrives in Lake Michigan. Lake Superior has no DDT. There are no Cohoe salmon in Lake Superior. Moral: Let's put DDT in Lake Superior so Cohoe salmon can grow there (Laughter). Absurd. Of course it's absurd. But no more so than the argument on the other side.

Mr. President, this may seem funny to some, but it saddens me. This is a very serious problem. It affects the tourist industry substantially in Wisconsin and Michigan, because many tourists are there for the fishing. Dean Butz is poking fun at scientific conclusions reached by men eminent in their field, including Federal and State officials.

What sort of attitude will Dean Butz, if his nomination shall be confirmed, take toward the expenditure of funds on biological pest control as a substitute for pesticides? Congress has appropriated these funds and it is up to the Department of Agriculture to spend them wisely. Can we seriously expect a man who has said that "we need to extol the benefits that come from these—pesticides—that we use," and has spent no little time making the case for pesticides, to work for their replacement by biological pest control techniques? I hardly think so.

Dean Butz has an "either or" philosophy. We have either got to live with chemical poisons or starve to death; we have either got to live with thermal pollution or have brown-outs; we have either got to beat the environmentalists or see agriculture slip backward. There are no compromises, no solutions, in his vocabulary—only confrontations. And confrontation is exactly what we do not need at this critical turning point in the history of man's impact on his environment—we need cooperation and a willingness to get on with the job of investigating alternatives to current practices that are environmentally dangerous.

Some Senators have discussed Dean Butz' conflict-of-interest problems. I want to make it clear that I am not opposing this nomination on a conflict-of-interest basis. It is true that Dean Butz has been in close association with agribusiness giants in the very recent past—companies such as Ralston-Purina, International Minerals and Chemical Corp., and Stokeley-Van Camp—companies that favor extensive use of pesticides and antibiotics—companies that favor vertical integration in farming. But I have no doubts regarding Dean Butz' sincere effort to make decisions as Secretary of Agriculture without regard to the impact those decisions will have on companies he has served as a director—companies that have had him on their payroll.

However I believe that the same philosophical leanings that resulted in Dean Butz' decision to ally himself with these companies in the first place, the attitudes he has expressed in a number of statements I have alluded to today, the attitudes that made him an important part of the Ezra Taft Benson team in the fifties, make him utterly unsuited to solve the problems confronting the small family farmer as well as the environ-

mental difficulties facing this Nation today.

Mr. President, the parity ratio for farmers has not been above 70 this year. Last year it averaged 72; and the year before, 74. This means that the farmer is getting less for his produce and spending more for the tools he needs to raise it. If Dean Butz is confirmed by the Senate today I see a bleak future for the farmer in general, but particularly the small family farmer. I see a future of even lower parity ratios, even greater out-migration from rural areas, increasing hazards to our environment. For all of these reasons I intend to vote against Dean Butz and I sincerely urge a majority of Senators to join with me. The winner will be the American farmer.

At this point I shall read into the Record a letter from the Governor of Wisconsin, the Honorable Patrick Lucey, which eloquently argues against the confirmation of Dean Butz:

DEAR BILL: I have written to all members of the Senate expressing my opposition to the appointment of Earl Butz as Secretary of Agriculture. I know that you have already expressed vigorous opposition to his appointment and I hope you are successful in your bid to defeat confirmation. My letter today was written on behalf of the farmers of Wisconsin whose livelihood and life style have been disregarded by the nomination of Earl Butz as Secretary of Agriculture.

Those appointed to high public office ought to be concerned with representing all individuals affected by the policies of that office. However, in the case of Mr. Butz, you are considering a man so clearly on the side of huge corporate farming that individual small farmers throughout our nation are bound to suffer.

Earl Butz is a proponent of the policies followed by Ezra Taft Benson, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture during the 1950's. As you know, these policies were an economic disaster, causing severe over-production of crops, huge surpluses, low prices and financial ruin for small farmers. It took practically the entire decade of the 1960's to get rid of the surpluses brought about by the Benson policies of the previous decade.

Earl Butz was Assistant Secretary of Agriculture from 1954 to 1957 under Ezra Taft Benson. From recent remarks, it is clear that he is interested in resurrecting an era of government mistake and mismanagement in the area of agriculture. He has called on small farmers to "adapt or die." He is philosophically opposed to price supports and acreage diversion. There is no indication that he has changed his view, espoused in 1955, that "too many people are trying to stay in agriculture that would do better someplace else."

In fact, that view seems to have hardened. His position on the Board of Directors of Ralston Purina, Stokeley-Van Camp and International Mineral and Chemical Company as well as his ties with the J. I. Case Company indicates that he is more interested in the profit of huge corporations than the well-being of individual farmers.

His economic ties have made him completely insensitive to the problems and needs of the small farmer. On one recent occasion he said, "I make no apologies to anyone for the participation I have taken in agribusiness companies." On another occasion he said, "Nostalgically we still look at agriculture as a way of life but agriculture is now big business." Both his recent remarks and his economic ties reflect his belief that the future shape of rural America should be domination of our agriculture and control of our land by the largest corporations.

As Governor of Wisconsin, I am extremely concerned about the effect the agricultural policies of Earl Butz would have on the farm-

ers of our state. It is obvious that he plans to reign over the demise of the small family farm both in our state and throughout the nation. It is equally obvious that under his regime huge corporate farming will grow to such proportions as to threaten the very existence of rural America as we know it today. Therefore, I urge you to reject the nomination of Earl Butz as Secretary of Agriculture and approve in his place a man more suited to represent all sectors of agriculture in our society.

Sincerely,

PATRICK J. LUCEY,  
Governor.

#### QUORUM CALL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I trust that it will be the final quorum call of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK). The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT ON DIVISION OF TIME TOMORROW ON BUTZ NOMINATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 9 a.m. tomorrow, the Senate go into executive session, that time on the nomination of Mr. Butz then begin running, that it be equally divided at that time so that both sides—regardless of the imbalance with respect to the utilization of time that has occurred this afternoon—will have equal time on tomorrow; and that that time run from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now return to the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period at this time for the transaction of routine morning business with the statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT FROM THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning grants approved by his office financed wholly with Federal funds and subject to the reporting requirements of Section 1120(b) of the Social Se-